DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 291 171 EC 201 785

AUTHOR Trach, John S.; Rusch, Frank R.

TITLE Supported Employment in Illinois: Program Implementation and Evaluation. Volume 1.
INSTITUTION Illinois Univ., Champaign. Secondary Transition Intervention Effectiveness Inst.
SPONS AGENCY Special Education Programs (ED/OSERS), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 87
CONTRACT 300-85-0160
NOTE 133p.; For volume 2, see EC 201 786.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Disabilities; Employment Services; Models; Program Development; *Program Evaluation; *Program Implementation; Technical Assistance; *Vocational Rehabilitation
IDENTIFIERS Illinois; *Supported Work Programs

ABSTRACT

This document includes reports of three research studies concerning the process of providing supported employment services to persons with disabilities. An introductory chapter by Frank Rusch et al. describes the Illinois Supported Employment Project, noting its target population and its technical assistance and program evaluation services. In "Supported Employment Program Development Degree of Implementation Manual," John Trach, Frank Rusch, and Lizanne DeStefano present an evaluation instrument that identifies five necessary components for establishing and maintaining a supported employment program applicable to all disability levels. In "Validation of an Instrument for Evaluating Supported Employment Programs: The Degree of Implementation," Trach and Rusch propose a supported employment model and an instrument to measure the degree to which programs implement the model, and examine supported employment programs in 33 adult vocational service agencies to determine the relationship between degree of implementation and various program outcomes. "Case Study Analysis of Three Supported Employment Model Programs: The Community, the Agency, and the Program," by Debbie Winking and Lizanne DeStefano, analyzes programmatic issues in urban, rural, and suburban supported employment programs, focusing on specific factors that might contribute to programmatic success. (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
John Trach
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED291171

Supported Employment in Illinois: Program Implementation and Evaluation

Volume 1

John S. Trach
Frank R. Rusch

EC201785

TRANSITION INSTITUTE AT ILLINOIS

The following principles guide our research related to the education and employment of youth and adults with specialized education, training, employment, and adjustment needs.

- Individuals have a basic right to be educated and to work in the environment that least restricts their right to learn and interact with other students and persons who are not handicapped.
- Individuals with varied abilities, social backgrounds, aptitudes, and learning styles must have equal access and opportunity to engage in education and work, and life-long learning.
- Educational experiences must be planned, delivered, and evaluated based upon the unique abilities, social backgrounds, and learning styles of the individual.
- Agencies, organizations, and individuals from a broad array of disciplines and professional fields must effectively and systematically coordinate their efforts to meet individual education and employment needs.
- Individuals grow and mature throughout their lives requiring varying levels and types of educational and employment support.
- The capability of an individual to obtain and hold meaningful and productive employment is important to the individual's quality of life.
- Parents, advocates, and friends form a vitally important social network that is an instrumental aspect of education, transition to employment, and continuing employment.

The Secondary Transition Intervention Effectiveness Institute is funded through the Office of Special Education Programs, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, U.S. Department of Education (contract number 300-85-0160).

Project Officer: Dr. Mel Appell

Additional support for this volume was provided by the Illinois Department of Rehabilitation Services, Governor's Planning Council on Developmental Disabilities, and Illinois Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities (grant number STILMIDOR-GPC-MHD983).

For more information on the Transition Institute at Illinois, please contact:

Dr. Frank R. Rusch, *Director*
College of Education
University of Illinois
110 Education Building
1310 South Sixth Street
Champaign, Illinois 61820
(217) 333-2325

Merle L. Levy, Publications Editor

Supported Employment in Illinois:
Program Implementation and Evaluation
Volume 1

John S. Trach

and

Frank R. Rusch

Secondary Transition Intervention Effectiveness Institute

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

EC 201785

© Copyright 1987 by the Board of Trustees
of The University of Illinois

CONTENTS

Preface v

Introduction to Supported Employment in Illinois: Current Status of the Initiative 1
Frank R. Rusch, John S. Trach, Debbie L. Winking, Jeffrey L. Tines, and Richard P. Schutz

Supported Employment Program Development: Degree of Implementation Manual 17
John S. Trach, Frank R. Rusch, and Lizanne DeStefano

Validation of an Instrument for Evaluating Supported Employment Programs: The Degree-of-Implementation . . . 51
John S. Trach and Frank R. Rusch

Case Study Analysis of Three Supported Employment Model Programs: The Community, the Agency and the Program 74
Debbie L. Winking and Lizanne DeStefano

Funded Programs 105

Supported Employment Publications 109

Illinois Supported Employment Program Staff 119

Preface

During the past few years there has been a proliferation of programs to provide supported employment for persons with disabilities. These employment options grew out of the earlier competitive employment efforts and model demonstration projects established to ensure long-term employment for persons with disabilities. The additional influx of both federal and state funds designated to increase supported employment efforts beyond those demonstration projects has meant the added responsibility of accountability not only for the outcomes of new efforts, but for the process of providing quality services to persons with disabilities. This new responsibility has led to the development of data collection systems to monitor the outcomes of supported employment as well as of innovative methods of analyzing the process of providing supported employment services to persons with disabilities. Evaluating the process as well as the outcome enables us to study the relationship between the two entities as a gauge of program effectiveness.

This issue of Supported Employment in Illinois includes reports of three research studies concerning the process of providing supported employment services to persons with disabilities. These articles describe the design of an instrument to measure the process of supported employment, present a validation of that instrument, and discuss the use of case study methodology as a means of studying the process of

supported-employment services delivery.

In Supported Employment Program Development Degree of Implementation Manual, Trach, Rusch, and DeStefano present an evaluation instrument that utilizes a research-based model of supported employment to assess programmatic efforts. This version of the instrument incorporates the results of two years of field-testing and feedback with supported employment programs in Illinois. The result is a revised edition that not only addresses the provision of services to persons with varying levels of disability, but also accommodates the different models for providing supported employment, individual, enclave, and mobile-work-crew placement. The model includes 26 activities organized into five components to define supported employment for persons with disabilities. The components include: (a) surveying the community, (b) matching target employees to potential placements, (c) providing initial training, (d) developing long-term follow-up, and (e) coordinating services across agencies. The instrument is scored through the review of written documentation. The Manual provides many examples of activity-related documentation and includes references to relevant literature. Also included are a scoring protocol and definitions of level of implementation for each activity. The Manual and definitions provide the template for an effective supported employment program.

Trach and Rusch provide additional information about the evaluation instrument in Validation of an Instrument for

Evaluating Supported Employment Programs: The Degree of Implementation. This study proposes a supported employment model and an instrument, the Degree of Implementation, to measure the degree to which programs implement this model. In addition this study examines the relationship between degree of implementation and various program outcomes. Supported employment programs developed by 33 adult vocational service agencies in Illinois served as the subject pool for data collection. Correlational analyses provided evidence of construct validity. In addition, an inverse relationship was found between IQ and hourly wage, and a direct relationship was found between job-matching activities and the number of hours spent in job development. This study provided not only a validation for the evaluation efforts in the Illinois initative, but also a direction for other evaluation efforts of supported employment across the nation.

Winking and DeStefano present a qualitative approach to process evaluation in Case Study Analysis of Three Supported Employment Model Programs: The Community, the Agency, and the Program. This study analyzes programmatic issues in supported employment through case studies of urban, rural, and suburban programs associated with the Illinios Supported Employment Initiative. The choice of programs for study was based on four criteria: (a) the development of multiple placement sites or enclaves, (b) the placement of the number of workers specified in their respective grants, (c) the provision of services to

individuals with severe disabilities, and (d) the attainment of scores in the upper quartile and within 5 points of one another on a Degree of Implementation measure. Winking and DeStefano discuss the community-based nature of supported employment programs and their obligation to meet the needs of a variety of consumers, groups, including parents, employers, workers with disabilities, and the community at large. The case studies focus on the multiple perspectives of these and other key stakeholders involved in the supported employment process (i.e., program staff, co-workers and other agency personnel). Individual program dynamics were analyzed to determine specific factors that might contribute to programmatic success in implementing supported employment. Thus, the analysis serves as an aid to agencies interested in replicating supported employment and highlights implications at the program, agency, and community levels.

We hope that this volume will provide insight into an evaluation method that utilizes a process-oriented perspective to determine the effectiveness of programming for supported employment. We welcome your comments and suggestions and hope that you find the document useful and informative.

John S. Trach

Frank R. Rusch

July 1987

Champaign, Illinois

Introduction to Supported Employment in Illinois: Current Status of the Initiative

Frank R. Rusch, John S. Trach,

Debbie L. Winking, Jeffrey J. Tines, and Richard P. Schutz

Two very important ways in which America measures its progress and achievements are in terms of the education and employment of its citizens. However, until 1975 one group of American citizens was frequently denied public education. With the passing of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act in 1975, education was mandated for every disabled person of school age, and people with disabilities are now enjoying the benefits of a public education. Unfortunately, employment opportunities continue to be severely limited for this group, and people with disabilities who are graduating from school may be the most unemployed, underemployed, and lowest paid of all American citizens. The facts are:

- Approximately 70% of all disabled Americans between the ages of 16 and 64 are unemployed.
- Only 25% of employed disabled Americans are employed full-time.
- The majority of these Americans are employed part-time.

It is clear that strong measures are needed by both the government and the private sector to educate people who are not disabled so that they can educate and rehabilitate people with disabilities to prepare them to be employed successfully in the community.

Because of recent, important changes in both education and rehabilitation legislation, the impetus exists to better educate consumers and educators alike. The focus of this report is upon changes in rehabilitation legislation and supported employment; specifically, the following report introduces supported employment in Illinois.

Overview of Changes in Rehabilitation Legislation

Because of recent changes in the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, supported employment is a new option available to all persons with disabilities. The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 was reauthorized for five years (Public Law 99-506) with special attention to supported employment as an option for direct services and project funding. Key changes included:

1. Title I (Basic State Agency Funding) addition of supported employment as an authorized vocational rehabilitation service and outcome,

2. Title III (Discretionary Grants) revision to include supported employment (and transitional services) as eligible funding activities,

3. Title VI (Employment Opportunities) expansion, adding Section C -- supported employment as a state formula-grant rehabilitation services program, supplementing the Title I allocation, and

4. changes in the definition of "severe handicap" to provide a more function-oriented definition that is somewhat compatible with the definition of developmental disability contained in the Developmental Disabilities Act (Public Law 98-527), although it is intended for a broader group with severe disabilities (including persons with severe physical disabilities) (Rehabilitation Act Amendments, 1986).

What Is Supported Employment?

Placement of persons with disabilities into integrated settings has evolved from research and demonstration activities during the past 15 years. Supported employment is one means of achieving integration whereby the worker receives continuing support for the duration of his or her employment. There are presently three models of supported employment: (a) individual placements, (b) enclaves, and (c) mobile work crews. In each case the support provided at the employment site is ongoing and is not expected to stop. The latter two models, however, rely upon more intense levels of continuing support. In some cases, the support is constant and continues for the duration of the employment period. Table 1 presents some of the distinguishing characteristics of the three supported employment models.

There are two basic types of supported employment placements, individual placements and group placements. Individual placements usually involve the training and employment of one person with a disability with the goal of eventually withdrawing daily supervision and training by, for example, a job coach. Group placement models such as the mobile work crew and enclave models typically involve ongoing supervision and training. Every model requires the employment of disabled employees in jobs where they will be working with employees who are not disabled and earning comparable wages for performing the same or similiar work or wages based on employee productivity compared to an established norm.

Although Table 1 describes the characteristics of three different supported employment models, it should be clear that employment in local community settings, integration with nondisabled workers, ongoing support, and fair wages are common elements of these and any supported employment model. It is natural to expect variations of these models to accommodate individual and employer needs and the employment situation of the local community. Variations of these models are only limited by the degree of ingenuity and flexibility of rehabilitation personnel developing supported employment services.

As a direct result of emerging supported employment models in Illinois, integrated employment opportunities for individuals with disabilities are gradually improving. Currently, supported employees in Illinois are earning an average salary of $3.21 per

Table 1

SUPPORTED EMPLOYMENT MODELS IN ILLINOIS.

	INDIVIDUAL PLACEMENT	MOBILE WORK CREW	ENCLAVE
Description	A single individual is hired by an employer in the community to perform a job.	A small group of three to five persons to work out of a van at several locations in the community with the supervision of a job coach.	A group of six to eight persons who work as a team at a specific location in a community business or industry.
Degree of Support	Job coach trains and assists the employee and gradually decreases the amount of support.	Continuous training and supervision provided by the job coach.	Continuous training and supervision provided by the job coach who may be employed by the company.
Typical Jobs	Food service, janitorial, assembly, hotel/motel housekeeping positions.	Grounds maintenance, custodial work janitorial, housekeeping, or catering work.	Light manufacturing, electronics subassembly, warehouse packing, industry work.
Mental or Physical Limitations	Persons should exhibit appropriate social skills and autonomy and eventually require minimal or no supervision and training.	Continuous supervision and training provided by this model will accommodate the needs of employees with severe handicaps and behavior problems.	Individuals with severe handicaps, behavior problems, and difficulty in attending to tasks can be successfully employed using this model.
Wages	Minimum wage or above.	Hourly wages based on client productivity compared to an established production norm.	Hourly wages based on productivity compared to an established production norm.

hour. At the average of 83.5 hours of work per month, the workers' average monthly gross income is $276. The results of Illinois supported employment indicate that persons with disabilities can successfully maintain their employment in the community with benefits that are comparable to those of nonhandicapped employees.

Who Is Served in Illinois?

The initial target population for the Illinois Supported Employment Initiative consists of those individuals with disabilities who traditionally have not been considered eligible for vocational rehabilitation services and who cannot obtain or maintain employment without ongoing support services.

The Illinois Supported Employment Initiative is designed as an alternative to day-activity and sheltered-employment programs. Owing to the interest in utilizing supported employment to extend services to individuals previously excluded from integrated work opportunities, it has been important for service providers to collect data that define the range of participant characteristics. As of July 1986, 514 individuals have received supported employment services provided by 30 adult service agencies throughout Illinois. The mean age of these workers was approximately 30 years old, and 63% of the workers were male. The full-scale IQ scores of the participants range from 17 to 97, with a mean IQ score of 62. In addition,

secondary impairments were identified for 60% of the workers. Appoximately 55% of the participants lived independently or semi-independently; just over 7% resided in an intermediate care facility for developmentally disabled; and 5% lived in a community residence facility.

The vast majority of the workers had previously received some form of vocational training, ranging from high school vocational education courses to developmental training services. In addition, 63% of the individuals had previously worked in sheltered workshops, and almost 43% of the individuals had had previous experience in competitive employment but were unable to maintain their jobs.

The Illinois Supported Employment Program (ISEP), which is based at the University of Illinois, provides several forms of assistance to rehabilitation personnel who are working with target employees, including technical assistance and program evaluation activities.

Technical Assistance

Technical assistance is provided on the basis of requests, identified needs, and general educational purposes of the funded programs, and is offered by telephone, mail, and site visit. From the beginning of the Project to date (7/1/85 to 4/1/87), staff members have disseminated 510 pieces of literature by mail, provided telephone consultation on 144 occasions, visited each agency at least 4 times for a total of 175 visits, and have made 132 visits to employment sites. In addition, staff members have

made 27 formal presentations on supported employment in Illinois.

To reach a larger audience on topics of common concern to all model programs, group technical assistance is delivered through a workshop series. These two-day workshops have allowed participants (e.g., job coaches, job placement specialists, program coordinators, state department personnel) to select sessions of direct relevance to their particular roles in providing supported employment seminars. Topics addressed at past workshops include marketing supported employment to the business community, teaching instructional strategies, using effective assessment instruments, and resource reallocation.

Nationally recognized presenters have introduced workshop participants to a wide range of regional efforts in supported employment. Invited speakers have included Dr. Timm R. Vogelsberg, Pennsylvania and Vermont programs; Michael Collins, Washington and Oregon programs; and Dr. Adelle Renzaglia, Virginia and Illinois programs. As the Illinois programs become increasingly implemented, the emphasis of the series has shifted to include greater contributions on the part of Illinois model programs as illustrations of best practices in the field.

Technical assistance has not been limited only to providing consultation for the model programs in Illinois. Because we realize the value of agency executive directors, state legislators, and others as resources to the supported employment initiative in Illinois, an effort is being made to unite these groups in support of the initiative. Toward this end, ISEP hosts

an annual meeting that focuses upon the benefits and costs of supported employment and highlights trends in employment.

Program Evaluation

The Illinois Supported Employment Project (ISEP) is evaluating model program degree of implementation and analyzing costs associated with supported employment. An important aspect of model program development is assessing the degree to which these model programs actually implement the characteristics that have been associated with important employment outcomes, such as average hours worked per month, hourly wage, and employment benefits, both monetary and nonmonetary.

ISEP also examines individual worker characteristics such as full-scale IQ scores, previous vocational training history, and residential living arrangements to monitor and evaluate the employment achievements of target employees. In addition, ISEP measures employment service characteristics such as the amount of time per month individuals receive vocational skills training, assessment, and case management services.

Degree of Program Implementation

In December 1985, field-based technical assistance was initiated using scheduled visits to each supported employment model demonstration program to collect implementation data. All visits followed the same structure, which was based on the

evaluation instrument--Degree of Implementation (DOI). During four rounds of visits, model programs (a) were introduced to the instrument and practiced scoring the DOI (Round 1--December 1985 to February 1986); (b) collected data on their programs (Round 2--March 1986 to April 1986); (c) had the opportunity to react to the first year challenge of developing, implementing, and documenting progress in their efforts to establish supported employment in their respective communities (Round 3--May 1986 to June 1986). The fourth round of visits (December 1986 to February 1987) was designed to establish the growth and stability of the efforts and to study further the DOI in order to determine its validity and utility as a standard for evaluating supported employment programs.

The Degree-of-Implementation (DOI) Instrument. The DOI instrument is based on the research literature related to national model demonstration development of supported employment programs (e.g., projects in Illinois, Vermont, and Virginia). The purpose of this instrument is to provide the Illinois Supported Employment Project (ISEP) with a standard against which to evaluate the implementation of state supported employment models and a method for assessing the technical assistance needs of individual model programs.

The DOI instrument is designed to evaluate the process of developing and maintaining a supported employment model. It can and has been used (a) to provide some structure for new supported employment model programs by informing them of relevant

activities identified through the literature, (b) to analyze the progress of the development of supported employment programs and to document developmental efforts in relationship to a time frame, (c) to investigate and identify possible variables that might facilitate program development, (d) to analyze the proposed model in relationship to actual documented services being provided, and (e) to investigate the relationship of the model to selected outcome variables (e.g., hourly wage, tenure). The instrument lists 28 steps or indicators that are categorized according to five supported employment program components: (a) Job Survey and Analysis, (b) Job Match, (c) Job Acquisition and Maintenance, (d) Conjunctive Job Services/Interagency Coordination, and (e) Job Fit. Using written documentation provided by the model program, the evaluator scores the presence or absence of each indicator either as 0, 1, or 2, or NO (nonexistent), EMERGENT (present but incomplete), and YES (present and complete), respectively. Pre-established written criteria determine the scoring of each indicator and serve as a manual for the administration of the instrument. The overall reliability obtained from the last set of ratings was .87 (Range = .75 to 1.00).

Data collection results. The results of efforts at implementing the proposed model of supported employment are presented in Table 2. Level of implementation is expressed in quartiles. The first quartile (0 - 25%) is the lowest level of implementation and indicates the degree (percentage of DOI

activities) to which a particular project has been implemented. The fourth quartile (76-100%) is the highest level of program implementation. Table 2 provides the percentages for each quartile in each of three rounds of data collection. The most current data suggest that 87% of the model programs are in the top three quartiles of implementation and that the most growth has occurred in the second quartile, whereas the third and fourth quartiles have remained relatively constant. At this writing, 13% of the programs are implementing 21 or more of the 28

Table 2

Percentages of Overall Scores by Quartile
Degree of Implementation

Quartile	Number of DOI Activities Implemented	March to April 1986 %	May to June 1986 %	December to February 1987 %
1 (0-25%)	0-7	42	30	13
2 (26-50)	8-14	21	33	47
3 (51-75%)	15-20	27	18	27
4 (76-100%)	21-28	9	18	13

supported employment activities (fourth quartile). The same percentage of programs implement 7 or less activities (first quartile), whereas 47% of the programs implemented between 8 to

14 activities (second quartile) and 27% of the programs implemented 15 to 20 activities (third quartile). Data on overall implementation over the six-month period indicate that the number of programs implementing more than 50% of the activities is increasing.

The most frequently implemented activities are those that survey the community (#1), task analyze potential jobs (#6), identify requisite skills (#8), assess and observe vocational skills (#12 and #14), and reassess through observation maintenance of vocational skills (#26).

Although these items represent the core of activities that most projects are implementing, they do not necessarily indicate activities that have produced the most desirable outcomes. For example, the identification of social skills and accompanying social skills assessment are implemented at a significantly lower rate than items related to vocational aspects of employment. Ironically, research literature indicates that persons with disabilities most often lose their jobs because of social skills deficits (Greenspan & Shoultz, 1981). These relationships can only be investigated by further study through correlational analysis. It is encouraging that more social skills assessments occurred in the last round than in previous rounds, as did more structured pre-placement observations. On the other hand, the lack of documentation to support a systematic procedure for matching job analysis information with assessment information indicates that there is still much improvement necessary in

activities within the job match component.

It is also troubling that there is a lack of systematic training, data collection, and withdrawal. Only 37% of the programs implement the Job Acqusition and Maintenance component. Because effective systematic training and data collection strategies are critical to successful supported employment, staff selection and development activities must seek to improve procedures in this area. The low-level implementation of Job Acquisition and Maintenance activities may be attributed to the type of client being served by the model programs. There is some indication that there is an inverse relationship between level of employee functioning and DOI scores; in other words, the higher the DOI score, the lower the level of target employee functioning and vice versa (Trach & Rusch, 1987).

Summary. The DOI data collection indicates that there has been a positive trend to increase the implementation of supported employment activities in the state of Illinois since June 1985. Job Survey and Analysis and Job Match are the most widely implemented components. The remaining three components--Job Acquisition and Maintenance, Conjunctive Job Services/Interagency Coordination, and Job Fit--are implemented at consistently lower levels. Some possible reasons for nonimplementation of DOI activities include: (a) lack of documentation, (b) inability to implement because of staff resources or lack of technology, (c) staff resistance to change, (d) level of target employee functioning, and (e) philosophical differences.

The trends in program implementation over time raise some interesting questions, such as whether the quality of services being provided have direct implication for attainment of favorable outcomes.

Cost of Supported Employment

Supported employment provides both monetary and nonmonetary benefits to its service recipients and to the taxpayer. Potential monetary benefits to the individual service recipient are defined in part by the gross income earned by the worker while he or she is participating in supported employment. The benefits to taxpayers are defined in part by the taxes paid by the target employee and by the fact that the target employee does not rely upon traditional tax-supported day programming options, such as work activity and adult day care.

The benefits of supported employment also can be examined in noncost terms. Because integration with co-workers is one component of the supported employment model, the number of new friendships developed, the opportunity for advancement within the work force, and the acquisition of additional duties reflect some of the social benefits that an individual may experience. The supported employment model clearly offers normal integrated work opportunities that sheltered work programs cannot.

Summary

Today, more than in any period preceding recent legislation, we have an opportunity to change our goals and the methods we use to serve persons with disabilities. In Illinois, a group of selected persons with disabilities earn more than $100,000 each month and are finding friends and opportunities that many of America's nondisabled are enjoying. In this respect, Illinois leads the country; no other state in America has provided the person with a disability employment opportunities alongside nonhandicapped employees, nonsheltered employment, and recognition as individuals.

References

Greenspan, S., & Shoultz, B. (1981). Why mentally retarded adults lose their jobs: Social competence as a factor in work adjustment. Applied Research in Mental Retardation, 2 (1), 23-38.

Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1986, 29 U.S.C. 701.

Rusch, F. R., & Phelps, L. A. (1987). Secondary special education and transition from school to work: A national priority. Exceptional Children, 53, 487-492.

Trach, J. S., & Rusch, F. R. (1987). Validation of an instrument for evaluating supported employment programs: The Degree of Implementation. (This volume).

Supported Employment Program Development
Degree of Implementation Manual

John S. Trach, Frank R. Rusch,

and

Lizanne DeStefano

Instructions to Users

The Degree of Implementation is based on the premise that any person, no matter how disabled, has the right to work for wages in integrated employment settings. The Degree of Implementation (DOI) is an evaluation instrument that identifies those components necessary for establishing and maintaining a supported employment program. Unlike programs that label some persons as unemployable, this model is applicable to all disabilities, regardless of severity, because it describes a program that is flexible enough to accommodate varying levels of disability.

The data obtained from this instrument will allow program developers and evaluators to compare a specific supported employment program to national standards. Correlational studies

of DOI data with certain outcome measures (e.g., type of job, hours worked, salary earned) can illustrate program processes and gauge program effectiveness. The DOI can provide direction for data-based staff development and identify areas within the program that are in need of further refinement.

This manual provides operational definitions for the scoring system to be used in the administration of the Degree of Implementation. Examples of relevant documents and considerations are provided to illustrate the criteria for each item.

Components of the Model

The five components that constitute the model of supported employment upon which the DOI is based are described below.

Community Survey and Job Analysis (Items 1-5). These activities are associated with surveying the community for potential job placement sites through telephone calls, mail correspondence, and personal contact. This component also involves identifying the vocational skills and social-interpersonal behavior requisites for a particular job.

The DOI recognizes nine occupational areas (Table 1) as

appropriate employment opportunities for persons with disabilities. **For the purpose of this instrument, valid employment opportunities do not, under any circumstances, include sheltered workshop employment, work activities, or adult day care.** Some communities might not include all of the occupational areas. Such exceptions should be noted before scoring the DOI and will not prevent a program from receiving a score of 2 on the item. Programs unwilling to develop job sites in certain occupational areas that are represented in the community can obtain a maximum score of 1 on DOI (see Item 1). Programs that have successfully placed the number of individuals that they have planned and contracted to place should be scored a 2 for subsequent DOI evaluations (i.e., later than 6 months after the start of the program). Programs that have changed sites or are developing additional sites are expected to repeat the entire Community Survey and Job Analysis component and should be scored accordingly.

Job Match (Items 7-10). This component concerns assessing target employee characteristics in relation to job requisites and includes documenting the use of standardized norm- and criterion-referenced tests along with ecological inventories as the basis for making accurate judgments that result in a successful job match.

Job Placement (first six months before **Job Maintenance** phase) (Items 11-16). Job placement refers to procedures utilized when training target employees to perform on the job.

Table 1

Recommended Categories for Job Development

Light Industrial--work related to manufacturing a product or preparing a product for market (e.g., assembly benchwork, production line worker)

Laundry--work related to laundering clothes or linens (e.g., towel machine operator, sheet ironer)

Warehouse--work related to shipping and receiving goods (e.g., stocking, loading/unloading trucks, delivery person)

Janitorial/Maintenance--work related to improving or maintaining a building's appearance (e.g., janitor, maid, building repair person)

Retail--work related to selling merchandise or services to consumers (e.g., clerk, gas station attendant, grocery bagger)

Grounds Maintenance--work related to maintaining grounds to be attractive, functional, and safe (e.g., lawn maintenance, gardening, leaf and snow removal, salting ice, removal of debris, trash collection, repair of sidewalks, painting)

Food Service--work related to preparing and serving food to large numbers of people in an institutional setting/restaurant business (e.g., server, busboy, cook, dishwasher)

Clerical--work related to processing information (e.g., file clerk, secretary, receptionist, typist, data processor)

Health Care--work related to the provision of health care services in a hospital, hospice, nursing home, or patient's residence (e.g., nurse's aide, bed stripper, lab technician, recreation therapist helper)

These procedures typically require vocational training techniques and job modifications to adapt the job to target employees' particular handicap(s), in addition to planning to maintain performance acquired through training, once the training period has ended.

Job Maintenance (Items 17-21). A primary consideration in supported employment is whether the target employee maintains his or her job. Evaluation and training activities are essential to helping the target employee to remain employed beyond the traditional "60-day work adjustment period." Job maintenance is conducted by reassessment of target employee performance, social validation of the quality of job performance, and modification of efforts to meet target employee and employer expectations.

Related Job Services/Interagency Coordination (Items 22-26). The items included in this component of the DOI relate to enhancing one's quality of life through multiple agency cooperation. The overall focus of this component is to ensure that the employee keeps his or her position in society. Related job services consist of the actual programs, individuals and subcomponents of participating agencies that provide the direct services needed to secure, train, and maintain a job placement. Interagency coordination convenes those agencies that function independently of each other, but provide necessary job services for a particular individual that might affect the job placement and retention of the target employee and the services within

each agency that work in conjunction with each other in order to attain work placement, train for and maintain work placement, and develop skills outside work placement that may promote or prohibit continued employment (e.g., social skills training and travel training provided by the employee's guardians or residence managers).

COMMUNITY SURVEY AND JOB ANALYSIS

Item 1. Conducts a community survey to identify potential jobs.

2 -- Files contain telephone, personal, or correspondence contact documents with businesses in the local community that indicate two prospective employers in each occupational area.*

1 -- Files contain telephone, personal, and/or correspondence contacts with businesses in the local community that indicate at least one prospective employer in each of occupational areas.

0 -- Businesses have been contacted in less than each of the occupational areas or documentation of community survey does not exist.

Relevant Documents to Review

Agency-completed surveys
Telephone survey response records and narrative questionnaires (Rusch & Mithaug, 1980)
Telephone records related to interactions and discussions with employer

Reference

Rusch, F. R., & Mithaug, D. M. (1980). Vocational training for mentally retarded adults: A behavior analytic approach. Champaign, IL: Research Press.

---

* Programs unwilling to develop job sites in certain occupational areas that are represented in the community can only obtain a score of 1 on Degree of Implementation (see Table 1). Programs must document lack of expertise or financial resources to develop multiple occupational areas.

Item 2. Compiles lists of businesses willing and not willing to employ individuals with handicaps.

(Note: If Item 1 is scored "0" Item 2 must be scored "0".

2 -- Documented written list has been compiled of businesses that are willing and not willing to employ individuals with handicaps in all of the occupational areas (Table 1; Item 1).

1 -- Documented written list has been compiled of businesses that are willing and not willing to employ individuals with handicaps in at least 50% of the occupational areas.

0 -- No list exists, or the list is limited to less than 50% of the occupational areas or less than 50% in the occupational areas identified.

Relevant Documents to Review

Written list of businesses willing and not willing to employ individuals with handicaps
Letters to and from businesses

Item 3. Obtains employer-validated job descriptions.

2 -- Actual job descriptions, which have been developed by employers, are available for each of the occupational areas listed in Item 1.

1 -- Actual job descriptions, which have been developed by employers, are available for 50% of the occupational areas listed in Item 1.

0 -- Less than 50% of the job descriptions in the occupational areas are available.

Relevant Documents to Review

Dated job descriptions from local businesses
Agency records indicating job coach has validated the job position
If a position has been created for a target employee, there must be documentation that the position is essential to the day-to-day operations of the business

Item 4. Conducts job analysis of targeted jobs (enclaves/work sites).

2 -- INDIVIDUAL PLACEMENT - Complete job analysis is written for at least one position in each of the occupational areas.

ENCLAVE or WORK CREW PLACEMENT - Complete job analysis is written for the target employment site(s) as well as one additional employment site.*

1 -- INDIVIDUAL PLACEMENT - Complete job analysis is written for one or more positions in at least 50% of the occupational areas (at least one targeted enclave or work crew site).

ENCLAVE or WORK CREW PLACEMENT - Complete job analysis is written for only the target employment site(s).

0 -- INDIVIDUAL PLACEMENT - No job analysis is available or the existing job analysis addresses less than 50% of the occupational areas (for none of the targeted enclaves or work crew sites).

ENCLAVE or WORK CREW PLACEMENT - No job analysis is available for any of the target employment site(s) or the existing job analysis is inadequate.*

Relevant Documents/Considerations to Review

Job coach actually performed the duties associated with target jobs
Job coach has documented target job based upon interviews and actual observation
Job Analysis Form (Martin, 1986) lists tasks associated with work station
List of necessary accessories (e.g., uniforms)
Mobility and safety requirements

Reference

Martin, J. E. (1986). Identifying potential jobs. In F. R. Rusch (Ed.), Competitive employment issues and strategies (pp.165-185). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

---

* No more than eight individuals may be placed in a single enclave, and the number of individuals with handicaps employed on a mobile work crew may not exceed the number of nonhandicapped employees.

Item 5. Identifies job-specific work performance skills, including necessary job modifications (Chadsey-Rusch & Rusch, in press).

2 -- Complete updated (within last 6 months) list exists of job-specific work performance skills in each of the occupational areas (targeted enclaves/work sites), including job modifications.

1 -- Complete list exists of job-specific work performance skills, including job modifications, for at least 50% of the occupational areas (targeted enclaves/work sites).

0 -- No list is available or the existing list of job-specific work performance skills, including job modifications, are available for less than 50% of the occupational areas (targeted enclaves/work sites).

Relevant Documents to Review

Restructure sequence of task
Reorganized work space
Redesigned entrances/exits
Proper use of a specific tool/machine (e.g., wrench, buffer)
Visually inspect a product
Discriminate "clean" and "not clean"

Reference

Chadsey-Rusch, J. C., & Rusch, F. R. (in press). The ecology of the workplace. In R. Gaylord-Ross (Ed.), Vocational education for persons with special needs. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.

Item 6. Identifies job-specific social-interpersonal skills.

2 -- Complete list is available of required social-interpersonal skills in each of the occupational areas.

1 -- Complete list is available of required social-interpersonal skills for at least 50% of the occupational areas.

0 -- No list is available or the list addresses less than 50% of the occupational areas.

Considerations for Skill Areas

Answers telephone appropriately while at work or in public places
Speaks clearly enough to be understood or can sign to communicate needs
Responds appropriately and immediately after receiving an instruction
Responds to an instruction requiring immediate compliance
Initiates contact with supervisor when an assigned task cannot be done
Responds to instruction from various supervisors
Works without displaying minor disruptive behaviors (e.g., interruptions)
Works without displaying major disruptive behaviors (e.g., arguments)

Reference

Rusch, F. R., Schutz, R. P., Mithaug, D. E., Stewart, J. E., & Mar, D. (1982). Vocational assessment and curriculum guide (VACG). Seattle, WA: Exceptional Education.

JOB MATCH

Item 7. Administers standardized vocational assessment instrument to evaluate work performance skills.

2 -- All target employees have been administered at least one standardized vocational assessment instrument to evaluate work performance skills within 30 days of their enrollment in the program.

1 -- At least 50% of all target employees have been administered at least one standardized vocational assessment instrument to evaluate work performance skills within 30 days of their enrollment in the program.

0 -- Less than 50% of all target employees have been administered at least one standardized vocational assessment instrument to evaluate work performance skills within 30 days of their enrollment in the program.

Acceptable Assessment Instruments

Vocational Assessment Curriculum Guide (VACG), (Rusch, Schutz, Mithaug, Stewart, & Mar, 1982)
San Francisco Vocational Competency Scale (Levine & Elzey, 1968)
Vocational Behavior Checklist (Walls, Zane, & Werner, 1978)

References

Levine, S., & Elzey, F. F. (1968). San Francisco vocational competency scale. New York: The Psychological Corporation.

Rusch, F. R., Schutz, R. P., Mithaug, D. E., Stewart, J. E., & Mar, D. (1982). Vocational assessment and curriculum guide (VACG). Seattle, WA: Exceptional Education.

Walls, R., Zane, T., & Werner, T. (1978). Vocational behavior checklist. Morgantown, WV: West Virginia Rehabilitation and Research Center.

Item 8. Administers standardized assessment to evaluate social-interpersonal skills.

2 -- All target employees have a record of at least one standardized assessment of social-interpersonal skills covering the domains of communication, daily living skills, socialization, and motor skills in their files within 30 days of their enrollment in the program.

1 -- At least 50% of all target employees have a record of at least one standardized assessment of social-interpersonal skills in their file within 30 days of their enrollment in the program.

0 -- Less than 50% of all target employees have a record of at least one standardized assessment of social-interpersonal skills in their file within 30 days of their enrollment in the program.

Acceptable Assessment Instruments

Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales (Sparrow, Balla, & Cicchetti, 1984)
Inventory for Client and Agency Planning (ICAP) (Bruininks, Hill, Weatherman, & Woodcock, R. W., 1986).
Scales of Independent Behavior (Bruininks, Woodcock, Weatherman, & Hill, 1984)
AAMD Adaptive Behavior Scales (Nihira, Foster, Shellhaas, & Leland, 1975)

References

Bruininks, R. H., Hill, B. K., Weatherman, R. F., & Woodcock, R. W. (1986). Inventory for client and agency planning. Allen, TX: Developmental Learning Materials/Teaching Resources.

Bruininks, R. H., Woodcock, R. W., Weatherman, R. F., & Hill, B. K. (1984). Scales of independent-Behavior. Allen, TX: Developmental Learning Materials/Teaching Resources.

Nihira, K., Foster, R., Shellhaas, M., & Leland, H. (1975). Manual for AAMD Adaptive Behavior Scale. Washington, D. C.: American Association on Mental Deficiency.

Sparrow, S. S., Balla, D. A., & Cicchetti, D. V. (1984). Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service.

Item 9. Observes work performance and social-interpersonal skills on the job.

2 -- Observational records are available for all target employees within 30 days of actual job placement. These records must include at least two observations in which one is obtained from the target job. The second can be from any other setting. Work performance, social-interpersonal skills, and other behaviors identified in the job analysis (e.g., grooming, mobility skills) must be included in both observations.

1 -- Observational records are available for all target employees within 30 days of actual job placement. These records include only one documented observation (i.e., observation from target job). Work performance, social-interpersonal skills, and other behaviors identified in the job analysis (e.g., grooming, mobility skills) must be included in both observations.

0 -- No documented observation exists for one or more targeted employees after 30 days of actual job placement.

Relevant Documents to Review

Job coach's notes from job site
Vocational counselor's observation at the workshop
Agency-developed observation forms/system

Item 10. Determines match of target employees' strengths/weaknesses in relation to alternative job placements.*

2 -- Each target employees' abilities have been documented in relation to two alternative jobs** within 30 days of assessment and observation. Documentation must consider Items 6 and 7 in relation to Items 8, 9, and 10.

1 -- At least 50% of the target employees' abilities have been documented in relation to two alternative jobs, or each target employee has only one job alternative documented.

0 -- Less than 50% of the target employees' abilities have been documented in relation to two alternative jobs, or at least 50% of all target employees have only one job alternative documented.

Relevant Documents to Review

Decision tree for job match
Meeting notes from job placement meeting and/or
Individual Program Planning (IPP)
Individual Habilitation Plan (IHP)
Individualized Written Rehabilitation Plan (IWRP)

---

* This item focuses upon the best possible job match while assessing strengths and weaknesses in order to guide programming decisions. **This item does not suggest that someone is unemployable or even less employable.**

** Alternative jobs can only be community based. Sheltered workshop employment or work activities cannot be considered one of the alternatives for scoring this item.

JOB PLACEMENT

(First six months before **Job Maintenance** phase)

Item 11. Evaluates target employees' performance to determine training needs.

2 -- All target employees' records include baseline data for work performance and social-interpersonal skills (at least one data sheet for each skill area). These records are active to within two weeks.

1 -- At least 50% of all target employees' records include baseline data for work performance and social-interpersonal skills (at least one data sheet for each skill area), or at least 50% of the records are more than two weeks old during **Job Placement** phase.

0 -- Less than 50% of all target employees' records include baseline data for work performance and social-interpersonal skills, or more than 50% of the records are older than two weeks during **Job Placement** phase.

Relevant Documents to Review

Job coaches' files, including current task analysis, observation, and recording forms, and graphs.
Individualized Written Rehabilitation Plan (IWRP)

Item 12. Utilizes behavior management strategies.

2 -- All target employee records include specific behavioral management strategies for each skill that was determined in Item 11 to require additional training.

1 -- At least 50% of all target employee records include specific behavioral management strategies for each skill that was determined in Item 11 to require additional training.

0 -- Less than 50% of all target employee records include specific behavioral management strategies for each skill that was determined in Item 11 to require additional training.

Relevant Documents to Review

Job coaches' files include behavior management plans that refer to training procedures and their effects on the target behavior
Completed behavioral observation forms and/or graphs
Staffing reports

Item 13. Restructures job to adapt to target employees' skills.

2 -- When necessary, target employee records include a plan for job redesign, including setting modification, task redesign, and equipment modification in addition to ongoing behavioral analysis.*

1 -- Agency and employee records indicate that a current work order/plan to address examples listed above is pending (work order must be no older than 30 days).

0 -- Job redesign has not been considered for target employee who could benefit, or promised modifications/redesign have not been made within 30 days.

Relevant Documents/Modifications to Review

Ramp installed for accessibility to worksite
Jig used for assembly
Co-worker pacing prompts
Job sequence modified
Lighting enhanced

---

*If documented that no modifications are necessary, score 2.

Item 14. Develops a plan to maintain acceptable levels of performance acquired through on-the-job training.

2 -- Evaluates, by direct observation, the degree to which target employees rely upon supervision to complete all aspects of a job. After evaluation, the job coach develops individual maintenance plans for all areas of target employees' performance that rely upon a job coach for supervision. The plan must contain provisions for withdrawing supervision or transferring supervisory responsibility to the employer. This evaluation and subsequent plans must be developed for all target employees within two to four months of employment.

1 -- At least 50% of all target employees have been evaluated by direct observation and have individual maintenance plans, as described above, after two to four months of employment.

0 -- Less than 50% of all target employees' have been evaluated by direct observation and have individual maintenance plans, as described above, after two to four months of employment or plans have not been completed after four months of employment.

Relevant Documents to Review

Written instructions related to fading assistance (i.e., prompts, preinstruction, job coach assistance, reinforcement schedule)
Co-worker/Follow-up contact sheets
Co-worker reinforcement plan
Individual maintenance plan
On-site contact sheets

Item 15. Develops plan for support services during Job Maintenance phase.

2 -- All target employees' records include, within four months of employment, a detailed written plan for follow-up services to occur throughout the first year. This plan must include the type of services needed, the personnel who are responsible, the schedule for delivery of services, and how to evaluate the services.

1 -- At least 50% of target employees' records include, within four months of employment, a detailed written plan for follow-up services as described above.

0 -- Less than 50% of target employees' records include, within four months of employment, a detailed written plan for follow-up services.

Relevant Documents to Review

Follow-up plan that contains a schedule of phone contacts and site visits on a daily and/or weekly basis (Rusch, 1986)
Detailed written plan

Reference

Rusch, F. R. (1986). Developing a long-term follow-up program. In F. R. Rusch (Ed.), Competitive employment issues and strategies (pp.225-232). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Item 16. Obtains feedback from employer/supervisor through work performance evaluations.

2 -- For each target employee currently in job placement, there exists an evaluation of the quality of his or her performance on the job. This evaluation must be conducted monthly for the first three months after initial job placement and as often as is warranted during the **Job Placement** phase. The statement should include a quantitative rating of strengths and weaknesses which must be obtained from the employer or a supervisor who has personnel evaluation responsibilities.

1 -- For at least 50% of all target employees currently placed, there exists an evaluation of the quality of performance on the job as described above.

0 -- For less than 50% of all target employees currently placed, there exists an evaluation of the quality of performance on the job as described above.

Relevant Documents to Review

Worker Performance Evaluation Form (WPEF) (White & Rusch, 1983)
Company Personnel Evaluation Form
Worker performance evaluation form mutually agreed upon by employer and training staff

Reference

White, D. M., & Rusch, F. R. (1983). Social validation in competitive employment: Evaluating work performance. Applied Research in Mental Retardation, 4, 343-354.

JOB MAINTENANCE

(continuous activity after **Job Placement** phase)

Item 17. Compares target employees' work performance and social-interpersonal skills to co-workers' behavior through monthly observation.

2 -- Job coaches' records indicate that all target employees and one co-worker who performs similar tasks have been observed at least once per month beginning with the first month after job placement and continuing throughout the employment period. These observations should relate directly to work performance and social-interpersonal skills identified in Item 9.

1 -- Job coaches' records indicate that at least 50% of all target employees and one co-worker who performs similar tasks have been observed at least once per month as described above.

0 -- Less than 50% of all target employees and one co-worker who performs similar tasks have been observed at least once per month.

Relevant Documents to Review

Direct observation and recording forms (White, 1986)

Reference

White, D. M. (1986). Social validation. In F. R. Rusch (Ed.), Competitive employment issues and strategies (pp.199-213). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Item 18. Obtains feedback from employer/supervisor through work performance evaluations after job placement period.

2 -- For each target employee currently in job placement, there exists an evaluation of the quality of his or her performance on the job. This evaluation must be conducted at least at often as all regular employees are evaluated or every six months. The statement should include a quantitative rating of strengths and weaknesses which must be obtained from the employer or a supervisor who has personnel evaluation responsibilities.

1 -- For at least 50% of all target employees currently placed, there exists an evaluation of the quality of performance on the job as described above.

0 -- For less than 50% of all target employees currently placed, there exists an evaluation of the quality of performance on the job as described above.

Relevant Documents to Review

Worker Performance Evaluation Form (WPEF) (White & Rusch, 1983)
Company Personnel Evaluation Form
Worker performance evaluation form mutually agreed upon by employer and training staff
Employer policy for personnel evaluations

White, D. M., & Rusch, F. R. (1983). Social validation in competitive employment: Evaluating work performance. Applied Research in Mental Retardation, 4, 343-354.

Item 19. Provides on-the-job training to meet employers'/supervisors' expectations.

2 -- All employees' records reflect continuous efforts to utilize behavior management strategies in response to employer/supervisor ratings (see Item 18).

1 -- At least 50% of employees' records reflect continuous efforts to utilize behavior management strategies in response to employer/supervisor ratings (see Item 18).

0 -- Less than 50% of employees' records reflect continuous efforts to utilize behavior management strategies in response to employer/supervisor ratings (see Item 18).

Relevant Conditions

Supervisor believes that work is of unacceptable quality
Employer does not believe that production is adequate
Employer believes employee is disruptive

Relevant Document to Review

Detailed written plan to address employer/supervisor concern and describe changes*

---

* The change statement should include the reason(s) for the change and revised training and evaluation plans.

Item 20. Assesses target employees' work performance skills annually with standardized vocational assessment instruments.

2 -- Within 12 to 14 months of the previous assessment, each target employee placed by the program has been administered the same vocational assessment instrument previously administered to evaluate work-performance skills.

1 -- For at least 50% of all target employees placed by the program, standardized assessment of work performance skills has been conducted within 12 to 14 months of the previous assessment.

0 -- Standardized assessment of work performance skills has been conducted for less than 50% of all target employees, or for any one employee more than 14 months after the previous assessment.

Acceptable Assessment Instruments

Vocational Assessment Curriculum Guide (VACG), (Rusch, Schutz, Mithaug, Stewart, & Mar, 1982)
San Francisco Vocational Competency Scale (Levine & Elzey, 1968)
Vocational Behavior Checklist (Walls, Zane, & Werner, 1978)

References

Levine, S., & Elzey, F. F. (1968). San Francisco Vocational Competency Scale. New York: The Psychological Corporation.

Rusch, F. R., Schutz, R. P., Mithaug, D. E., Stewart, J. E., & Mar, D. (1982). Vocational Assessment and Curriculum Guide (VACG). Seattle, WA: Exceptional Education.

Walls, R., Zane, T., & Werner, T. (1978). Vocational Behavior Checklist. Morgantown, WV: West Virginia Rehabilitation and Research Center.

Item 21. Assesses target employees' social-interpersonal skills annually with standardized assessment instruments.

2 -- Within 12 to 14 months of the previous assessment, each employee placed by the program has been administered the same standardized assessment of social-interpersonal skills previously administered to evaluate the domains of communication, daily living, socialization, and motor skills.

1 -- For at least 50% of all employees placed by the program, standardized assessment of social-interpersonal skills has been conducted within 12 to 14 months of the previous assessment.

0 -- Standardized assessment of social-interpersonal skills has been conducted for less than 50% of all employees, or for any one employee more than 14 months after the previous assessment.

Acceptable Assessment Instruments

Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales (Sparrow, Balla, & Cicchetti, 1984)
Inventory for Client and Agency Planning (ICAP) (Bruininks, Hill, Weatherman, & Woodcock, 1986).
Scales of Independent Behavior (Bruininks, Woodcock, Weatherman, & Hill, 1984)
AAMD Adaptive Behavior Scales (Nihira, Foster, Shellhaas, & Leland, 1975)

References

Bruininks, R. H., Hill, B. K., Weatherman, R. F., & Woodcock, R. W. (1986). Inventory for client and agency planning. Allen, TX: Developmental Learning Materials/Teaching Resources.

Bruininks, R. H., Woodcock, R. W., Weatherman, R. F., & Hill, B. K. (1984). Scales of independent behavior. Allen, TX: Developmental Learning Materials/Teaching Resources.

Nihira, K., Foster, R., Shellhaas, M., & Leland, H. (1975). Manual for AAMD adaptive behavior scale. Washington, D. C.: American Association on Mental Deficiency.

Sparrow, S. S., Balla, D. A., & Cicchetti, D. V. (1984). Vineland adaptive behavior scales. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service.

RELATED JOB SERVICES/INTERAGENCY COORDINATION

Item 22. Identifies potential agencies that provide employment services.

2 -- An up-to-date list exists that identifies at least three potential agencies that provide employment services (a contact with the potential agency to provide employment services has been made within 30 days). The list includes name of agency, address, phone number, contact person, and potential services the agency can provide.

1 -- A list, as described above, of two potential agencies exists, or any one of the contacts with the agencies is older than 6 months.

0 -- No list exists or any of the contacts with any of the agencies is older than 1 year.

Relevant Agencies to Include

Local Department of Vocational Rehabilitation
State Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (e.g., Illinois Department of Rehabilitation Services - DORS)
Association of Retarded Citizens (ARC)
Parent Groups (e.g., Parent CHAIN)
Community Colleges
Trade Schools
Local Education Agency
State Education Agency
Labor Unions
Job Training Partnership Association
Vocational Evaluation Centers
Local Rehabilitation Facility
Private Industry Council (PIC)
Targeted Job Tax Credit (TJTC)

Item 23. Identifies employment services within each potential agency (see Item 21) that could promote continuation in present placement.

2 -- For each target employee currently placed, a list of services is developed that could be provided by agencies identified in Item 22 to enhance job performance and promote continuation of placement.

1 -- For at least 50% of the target employees currently placed, a list exists as described above.

0 -- A list of services exists for less than 50% of all target employees placed or the existing list does not meet above specifications.

Relevant Considerations to Review

Advocacy (ARC)
Evaluation
Support groups
Transportation and travel training
On-the-job training (OJT)
Union representation/participation
Tax incentives (TJTC)
Wages (OJT)

Item 24. Identifies agencies able to provide employment-related services.

2 -- An up-to-date (a contact with the agency that can provide employment services has been made within 30 days) list exists that identifies at least three agencies that could provide employment-related services (e.g., transportation, financial advisement, medical treatment). The list includes name of agency, address, phone number, contact person, and potential services the agency provides.

1 -- A list, as described above, of two potential agencies exists or any one of the contacts with the agencies is older than six months.

0 -- No agency has been contacted or any of the contacts with the agencies is older than one year.

Relevant Agencies to Include

Centers for Independent Living
Social Security Administration (SSA)
Association for Retarded Citizens (ARC)
Parent Groups (e.g., parent CHAIN)
Residential facility (e.g., Group Home)
Departments of Mental Health
Departments of Developmental Disabilities
University Affiliated Facilities
Local Education Agencies
Community College System
Public Aid

Item 25. Identifies employment-related services within each agency that could promote continuation in present placement.

2 -- For each target employee currently placed, a list of services is developed that could be provided by agencies identified in Item 24 to enhance job performance and promote continuation of placement.

1 -- For at least 50% of the target employees currently placed, a list exists as described above.

0 -- A list of services exists for less than 50% of all target employees placed, or the existing list does not meet above specifications.

Relevant Considerations to Review

Housing
Advocacy
Transportation and travel training
Financial Advisement
Residential coordination
Leisure-time consultation
Health-care services
Support groups
Evaluation
Psychological services

Item 26. Revises Individualized Written Rehabilitation Plan to include interagency cooperation that focuses upon long-term employment through case management.

2 -- For each target employee currently placed, a detailed written plan exists that specifies the agencies involved, the services they have agreed to provide, reporting and feedback procedures, and budgetary agreements. It is expected that this plan will be developed in an interagency meeting.

1 -- For at least 50% of all target employees currently placed, a detailed written plan exists as described above.

0 -- For less than 50% of all target employees currently placed, a detailed written plan exists or is not in accordance with the above description.

Relevant Documents to Review

Minutes of interagency case coordination meetings
Written plan for interagency staffing
Individualized Written Rehabilitation Plan
Individual Habilitation Plan (IHP)
Cooperative agreements with agencies

References

Bruininks, R. H., Hill, B. K., Weatherman, R. F., & Woodcock, R. W. (1986). Inventory for client and agency planning. Allen, TX: Developmental Learning Materials/Teaching Resources.

Bruininks, R. H., Woodcock, R. W., Weatherman, R. F., & Hill, B. K. (1984). Scales of independent behavior. Allen, TX: Developmental Learning Materials/Teaching Resources.

Chadsey-Rusch, J. C., & Rusch, F. R. (in press). The ecology of the workplace. In R. Gaylord-Ross (Ed.), Vocational education for persons with special needs. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.

Levine, S., & Elzey, F. F. (1968). San Francisco vocational competency scale. New York: The Psychological Corporation.

Martin, J. E. (1986). Identifying potential jobs. In F. R. Rusch (Ed.), Competitive employment issues and strategies (pp.165-185). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Nihira, K., Foster, R., Shellhaas, M., & Leland, H. (1975). Manual for AAMD adaptive behavior scale. Washington, D. C.: American Association on Mental Deficiency.

Rusch, F. R. (1986). Developing a long-term follow-up program. In F. R. Rusch (Ed.), Competitive employment issues and strategies (pp.225-232). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Rusch, F. R., & Mithaug, D. M. (1980). Vocational training for mentally retarded adults: A behavior analytic approach. Champaign, IL: Research Press.

Rusch, F. R., Schutz, R. P., Mithaug, D. E., Stewart, J.E., & Mar, D. (1982). Vocational assessment and curriculum guide (VACG). Seattle, WA: Exceptional Education.

Sparrow, S. S., Balla, D. A., & Cicchetti, D. V. (1984). Vineland adaptive behavior scales. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service.

Walls, R., Zane, T., & Werner, T. (1978). Vocational behavior checklist. Morgantown, WV: West Virginia Rehabilitation and Research Center.

White, D. M. (1986). Social validation. In F. R. Rusch (Ed.), Competitive employment issues and strategies (pp.199-213). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

White, D. M., & Rusch, F. R. (1983). Social validation in competitive employment: Evaluating work performance. Applied Research in Mental Retardation, 4, 343-354.

Validation of an Instrument for Evaluating Supported Employment Programs: The Degree of Implementation

John S. Trach

and

Frank R. Rusch

The current emphasis on employing persons with severe disabilities in integrated settings has resulted in a proliferation of vocational service delivery models. These models have evolved from research and development activities over the past several years (cf. Bates & Pancsofar, 1981; Bellamy, Sheehan, Horner, & Boles, 1980; Rusch & Mithaug, 1980; Vogelsberg, Williams, & Fox, 1981; Wehman, 1981). One of the more promising models is the supported employment model (Bates & Panscofar, 1983; Rusch, 1983; Vogelsberg, 1984; Wehman & Kregel, 1985; Wilcox & Bellamy, 1982).

Rusch (1986) identified five nationally recognized supported employment models, including university-based programs (Moss, Dineen, & Ford, 1986; Wehman, 1986), school-based programs (Bates, 1986), and adult service agency programs (Lagomarcino, 1986; Vogelsberg, 1986). There is some variation in terminology

and design across supported employment models that have been implemented, but there also appear to be common activities that can be used to define these models.

Although there appears to be some agreement regarding the components of the supported employment model among model program innovators, these components have not been validated. Because program developers are at risk of adopting practices that may not be important to overall program effectiveness, the primary purpose of this study was to validate reported components of the supported employment programs using standard validation procedures (Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing, 1985).

Through a review of research literature and an analysis of existing supported employment programs, this investigation identified the following components in the supported employment model: (a) job survey and analysis, (b) job match, (c) job acquisition and maintenance, (d) conjunctive job services/interagency coordination, and (e) job fit. These components formed the model that served as the basis for developing statewide replications in Illinois. The instrument developed in this study is referred to as the Degree of Implementation (DOI). Validation of this instrument is important because the instrument can function as a formative

and summative evaluation tool. It can also serve as a valid assessment device for data-based staff and program development by providing program directors, coordinators, and direct service providers (e.g., job coach) with a clear description of what activities are involved in providing supported employment services.

Components of the Model

The five components that constitute the model of supported employment upon which the DOI is based are described below.

Job survey and analysis. Job survey and analysis refers to activities associated with surveying the community for potential job placement sites through phone calls, correspondence, and personal contact, and identifying requisite vocational skills and social behavior.

Job match. Job match refers to assessing client characteristics in relation to job requisites.

Job acquisition and maintenance. Job acquisition refers to procedures utilized in training clients to perform on the job; job maintenance refers to procedures utilized in assisting the individual in retaining the target job once he or she learns the job. These procedures typically utilize vocational training techniques, job modifications to adapt the job to clients' particular handicap(s), and planning to maintain performance acquired through training once the training period ended.

Conjunctive job services/interagency coordination.

Conjunctive job services comprise the actual programs, individuals, and subcomponents of participating agencies that provide the direct services needed to secure, train, and maintain a job placement. Interagency coordination convenes those agencies that function independently of each other, but provide necessary job services for a particular individual. These services and efforts incorporate (a) the ongoing coordination of all agencies involved with the client that provide services that might affect the job placement and retention, and (b) the services within each agency that work in conjunction with each other in order to attain work placement, train for work placement, maintain work placement, and develop skills outside the work placement that may promote or prohibit continuation in placement (e.g., social skills training and travel training provided by the client's guardians or residence managers).

Job fit. Assessment of the match between the individual, the job, the quality of work, and the other life settings indicates the fit of the job to the individual. Job fit can be determined by reassessment of client performance during and after training, socially validating the quality of job performance, and modifying efforts to meet client, employer, and parent or guardian expectations.

Two questions were addressed in this study. The first question relates to construct validity and focuses upon the relationships among the five components of the Degree of

Implementation and between each component and the overall DOI score. The second question attempts to collect further evidence of construct validity by examining the relationship between component and overall DOI scores and selected outcomes, namely IQ, wages, and time spent in job development.

Method

Instrumentation

The Degree of Implementation (DOI) is an instrument designed to evaluate the degree to which program developers have implemented the model (see Figure 1). The instrument lists 28 activities of the model which were categorized into five generic components: (1) Job Survey and Analysis, (2) Job Match, (3) Job Acquisition and Maintenance, (4) Conjunctive Job Services/Interagency Coordination, and (5) Job Fit.

Scoring. To evaluate each supported employment program, the University of Illinois staff scored the presence (absence) of each of the activities. A three-part scoring system was utilized. The scoring system required classifying an activity as nonexistent (score = 0), emergent (score = 1), or present (score = 2). For example, if a program had documented the development of individualized training plans for at least 50% of the individuals placed at employment sites (Item #16), that activity would have been scored 1, or emergent. If that same program had documented the development of training plans for all

of the individuals placed at the employment sites, that activity would have been scored 2, or present. A manual was developed with pre-established written criteria to determine the scoring of each component's presence.

General Procedures

Model program development. The model programs included 33 adult vocational service agencies funded by the State of Illinois to implement the supported employment model. These programs were developed as new services to complement existing vocational services in each agency. Agencies hired new project staff to coordinate supported employment efforts and defined a new position (job coach) to provide direct services. Model programs became operational between July 1, 1985 and February 28, 1986. Client enrollment in each program varied due to actual funding, hiring new staff, adopting changes in programming policies, and overall acceptance of individuals with handicaps by community employers.

Model programs were established primarily in urban and suburban areas with about 25% of the total number of projects located in rural areas. Each program served from 4 to 30 individuals with severe disabilities who had previously been excluded from community placement due to the severity of their handicap.

Technical assistance. Technical assistance was provided to model programs implementing the supported employment model.

Figure 1

Degree of Implementation Protocol

SUPPORTED EMPLOYMENT
DEGREE OF IMPLEMENTATION

The degree of implementation form may be completed for each program by the project director as part of job trainer supervision or university personnel on a site visit to deliver technical assistance. It will be necessary to examine job trainer logs and other program documentation in order to complete the form.

The instrument utilizes a 3-point scoring system to rate both the frequency and quality of the task performed. The point system works as follows:

2 - YES - The activity is completed as regularly as mandated or as often as necessary at acceptable level of quality.

1 - EMERGENT - The activity is being carried out but with less frequency or quality than is desirable. Technical assistance/staff development is indicated.

0 - NO - The activity is not carried out or is done so inappropriately. Those items considered "not applicable" to a program should be scored 0 then explained. Technical assistance/staff development is strongly indicated.

Job Survey and Analysis	NO	EMERGENT	YES
1. Conducts a community survey for potential jobs.	0	1	2
2. Develops a list of companies/agencies willing to employ clients.	0	1	2
3. Targets specific jobs within particular company/agency.	0	1	2
4. Socially validates targeted jobs.	0	1	2
5. Determines which company/agency is appropriate for placement.	0	1	2
6. Task analyzes targeted jobs within companies.	0	1	2
7. Socially validates task analysis for particular job.	0	1	2
8. Identifies requisite skills or modifications necessary for job.	0	1	2
9. Socially validates necessary vocational skills.	0	1	2
10. Determines necessary social survival skills (e.g., appropriate communication skills, transportation skills).	0	1	2
11. Socially validates social survival skills.	0	1	2

Figure 1 (cont.)

	NO	EMERGENT	YES
Job Match			
12. Assesses client's vocational skills with standardized assessment (e.g., Vocational Assessment and Curriculum Guide).	0	1	2
13. Assesses client's social skills with standardized assessment (e.g., Vineland Social Maturity Scale).	0	1	2
14. Assesses client's vocational and social skills through observation.	0	1	2
15. Determines match of client's characteristics to the job requisite skills.	0	1	2
Job Acquisition and Maintenance			
16. Utilizes applied behavior analysis.	0	1	2
17. Modifies job to adapt to particular client's handicap.	0	1	2
18. Proposes plan to maintain the level of performance acquired through training (e.g., self-monitoring techniques).	0	1	2
19. Proposes plan for follow-up services.	0	1	2
Conjunctive Job Services/Interagency Coordination			
20. Identifies potential agencies to provide vocational services.	0	1	2
21. Identifies potential agencies to provide social services.	0	1	2
22. Identifies services within each potential agency that promote continuation in present placement.	0	1	2
23. Proposes plan for agency coordination and job services from each agency to be provided in conjunction with job training.	0	1	2
Job Fit			
24. Reassess client's vocational skills periodically with standardized assessment instruments.	0	1	2
25. Reassess client's social survival skills periodically with standardized assessment instruments.	0	1	2
26. Reassess client's social and vocational skills through monthly observation.	0	1	2
27. Socially validates the quality of performance on the job.	0	1	2
28. Modifies job training to meet client, employer, and parent guardian expectations.	0	1	2

This assistance was provided by the University of Illinois. Technical assistance activities were provided via telephone, mailings, and site visits. Three site visits were made to each program during the first year. In addition, five seminars were offered to model program personnel throughout the first year. The goal of the technical assistance was to provide model program developers with information regarding implementation of the critical components of a supported employment program.

Data collection. All data were collected by University of Illinois staff during scheduled site visits. Two staff members were responsible for all site visits and data collection. During these site visits, each agency's program coordinator and other designated program personnel provided staff members with written documentation related to each component of the degree of implementation. Data were collected over five weeks in May and June 1986.

Outcome data collection. Descriptive outcome data (i.e., IQ score, hourly wage, and number of job development hours) were provided by each agency on a monthly basis. Each model program responded by mail to questions regarding individual demographic data (e.g., IQ score, adaptive behavior score, additional handicapping conditions), individual employment status (e.g., length of employment, number of hours worked weekly, hourly wage), training data (e.g., hours of direct training, advocacy, case coordination), and project implementation data (e.g., hours spent in job development, number of individuals placed, program costs) for each person they served.

Reliability. The two University of Illinois staff members who provided on-site technical assistance were trained to collect data on degree of implementation. Training consisted of making 10 site visits jointly in order to agree on the scoring procedures. The two staff members then divided and visited the remaining 23 model programs. After each series of visits, the staff members compared scorings in order to clarify further any inconsistencies in scoring any items on the instrument.

Reliability was collected on 6 of the 33 programs during the second round of site visits by conducting two separate and independent site visits (this second round of data was used for analysis in this study). Program coordinators were instructed to provide each staff member with identical information. Scores were then compared, and a percent agreement was calculated.

Selected Outcome Variables

IQ. Model programs reported IQ scores for each individual placed. A mean IQ score was calculated for each program.

Hourly wage. The mean hourly wage earned for each program was calculated using all individuals' hourly wages.

Hours spent in job development. Each program recorded the number of hours that were spent to develop employment sites in order to place the individuals. The mean number of hours per worker was calculated by dividing this number by the number of individuals placed by a particular program.

Data Analysis

Correlational analyses were used to answer the two research questions concerning to construct validity. The integrity of each component and its relationship to the overall score was examined using a Pearson product-moment correlational analysis to create a correlational matrix comparing each of the five component scores (e.g., Job Survey and Analysis) with each of the other four component scores (e.g., Job Fit, Job Acquisition and Maintenance, Job Match), and each component score with the total Degree-of-Implementation score for each program.

In addition, a correlational analysis was performed to determine the extent to which each component score and the total score intercorrelated with the three outcome variables.

Results and Discussion

Reliability

Reliability data were collected on six separate occasions. Percent agreement was used as a measure of reliability. Reliability ranged from 75 to 96% with a mean score of 90%. The lowest score (.75) was attributed to a program coordinator who had provided additional documentation to one rater.

Validation

Correlational analysis for each component score in relation to each of the other component scores yielded moderate

correlations (range = .49 - .75), all of which were significant at the .01 level and above (see Table 1). These moderate correlations indicate that the components measure the same general construct to some extent, at the same time retaining enough differences to measure some unique aspect of that construct. This evidence supports the validity of the five components of the DOI for measuring a unique aspect of the model as well as collectively contributing to a composite score representative of the overall implementation of the program.

The component scores correlated with the total score on the DOI. These correlations were significant at the .001 level. These high correlations (range = .70 - .93) indicate that each component score is directly related to the total DOI score and contributes very significantly to its composition. The best predictor of overall DOI score was job survey, followed by job acquisition and maintenance, job fit, and job match. The category conjunctive job services/interagency coordination was the poorest predictor of overall implementation, possibly because this activity is more important to fully operational programs. Most programs were not fully implemented because they had been operating for only a short time.

Summary Statistics and Outcome Intercorrelations

The summary statistics in Table 2 indicate that although DOI data were collected on 33 programs, outcome data were not available from all programs. Means, standard deviations, and

Table 1

Correlational Analysis fo the Components of the Degree-of-Implementation Instrument with Other Components and the Total Score and Summary Statistics (N = 33)*

	Job Match	Job Acqu. and Main.	Con. Job Ser./ Inter. Coord.	Job Fit	Total Score	$\bar{X}$ (Range)**	S.D.
Job Survey	0.69	0.75	0.49	0.73	0.93	11.39 (0-22)	6.77
Job Match	-	0.66	0.56	0.55	0.80	4.03 (0-8)	2.26
Job Acqu. and Main.	-	-	0.49	0.65	0.85	3.24 (0-8)	3.17
Con. Job Ser./ Inter. Coord.	-	-	-	0.58	0.70	1.94 (0-8)	2.85
Job Fit	-	-	-	-	0.83	3.27 (0-8)	2.38
Total Score	-	-	-	-	-	23.88 (0-50)	14.82

* All values significant at .01, those values greater than or equal to .55 are significant at .001.

** Total possible range for each component and total score is 22, 8, 8, 8, 10, and 56, respectively.

ranges are reported for the three outcome variables used in this study. Note that all correlational analyses were performed on variables and scores aggregated at the program level.

The intercorrelations between the selected outcomes seem to indicate a direct relationship between IQ and hourly wage, an inverse relationship between IQ and hours of job development, and a significant direct relationship between the hourly wage and the hours spent in job development. Although neither of the first two correlations is significant, they appear to indicate that the hourly wage increases as the IQ of the individual goes up, and that individuals with lower IQs need more hours of job development. Both of these findings are in accord with expectations that individuals with higher IQs would obtain better-paying jobs, and identifying employment for individuals with lower IQs would require more intense job-development efforts. Investigation of both the effectiveness of job-development efforts as well as employment expectations for individuals with lower-functioning levels might suggest alternate explanations.

Outcome Correlations

Table 3 presents the correlations between the overall DOI score, its components, and reported outcomes.

First variable: IQ. The first set of correlations, with IQ as a variable, demonstrated an inverse relationship to the overall DOI score; that is, more elements of the proposed model

Table 2

Summary Statistics and Intercorrelational Analysis of Selected Outcomes

	N	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Range	Hourly Wage	Job Development (Hrs)
IQ	26	61.63	7.33	47.50 to 76.90	0.31[a]	-0.03[b]
Hourly wage	24	3.17	1.25	1.60 to 7.15	-	0.48[c]
Job Development (Hrs)	22	2.33	2.70	0.00 to 7.54	-	-

[a] N=23

[b] N=21

[c] N=22; $p < .05$

Note. All variables and scores aggregated at the program level.

Table 3

Correlational Analysis of the Degree of Implementation With Selected Outcomes

	N	Job Survey & Analysis	Job Match	Job Acquisition & Maintenance	Conj. Job Services/ Int. Coord.	Job Fit	Total DOI Score
IQ	26	-0.40*	-0.46*	-0.43*	-0.15	-0.33	-0.43*
Hourly wage	24	-0.02	-0.11	-0.21	-0.18	-0.01	-0.11
Hours of job development	22	0.46*	0.48*	0.25	0.21	0.23	0.43*

* $p < .05$

Note. All variables and scores aggregated at the program level.

were found to be in place as IQ scores of the clients decreased. Conversely, as IQ scores increased, fewer components of the model were found to be in place. Thus, it appeared that level of client functioning was inversely related to the intensity of services necessary to obtain employment. It may be that fewer services associated with the various components are necessary with higher functioning clients.

This finding is supported by the significant correlation between IQ and the total DOI score. Three other significant correlations in this set (job survey and analysis, job match, and job acquisition and maintenance) lend additional support to this finding. Once again, these components were inversely related to IQ. These findings indicate that the need for activities related to these components may be more necessary when placing persons with lower IQs. These findings do not imply that the model is not applicable for less severely handicapped individuals; these data suggest that some model programs were not implemented as completely with mildly handicapped as with severely handicapped clients.

Second variable: Hourly wage. These correlations indicated an inverse relationship between the hourly wage and overall DOI scores. This finding suggests that higher hourly wages were earned when fewer components of the model were implemented, which follows the previous line of thinking that fewer components of the model were implemented for higher functioning workers who could expect and earn a higher hourly wage.

Third variable: Hours of job development. Finally, significant positive correlations between the number of hours spent in job development, job survey and analysis, and job match scores suggest that more job surveying and matching activities occurred in programs that spent more hours in job development. This finding might simply be a function of the capability of these programs to perform more job-matching activities when there was a larger selection of job possibilities, and more time surveying the community increases the number of recorded hours of job development per individual placed in supported employment. The significant correlation of this variable with the total DOI score may have occurred because the job survey component is the largest (11 of the 28 activities). Nevertheless, this significant relationship indicates that as more hours were spent in job development, the total DOI score increased. These significant positive relationships seem to reflect the intensity with which some programs searched for jobs that potential workers might be able to perform. Those programs that spent more hours in job development implemented more of the model.

General Discussion

This study provides evidence that supports the validity of an instrument used to measure the degree to which model supported employment programs in Illinois are implemented. This

research suggests that the instrument's items measure unique components of the supported employment model and contribute to a composite score that reflects overall implementation. These relationships are evidence of construct validity of the instrument.

The data presented here also support several reasons for implementing the suggested employment model. These include: (a) the need for more intense efforts to serve a lower-functioning population of workers, (b) the relationship between more hours spent in job development which results in higher hourly wages as well as more opportunities to match an individual to the most appropriate employment option.

The data also pose some interesting questions that warrant further investigation. For instance, the components of the model that combine to produce the most effective outcomes for a particular disabled population are not fully understood. An item analysis and further correlational analyses of various combinations of the components and parts of the components with various outcomes might lend some explanation. Also, employment outcomes for individuals with severe handicaps are just emerging. Statewide efforts such as those reported in this volume suggest that persons with severe handicaps are adapting to nonsheltered employment, along with their direct service providers and advocates. Continued data collection and analysis may afford a more complete picture of these employment options. Further study is needed to establish the relationship between

what services are delivered by a program and what is accomplished through those services. The correlation between process variables and outcome variables should be assessed through analysis of follow-up cases. This type of research could enable researchers to support empirically their contention that their models attained the outcomes they targeted, allow other researchers to investigate outcomes of service delivery models, and establish some standard to provide services and investigate outcomes in the context of model variations and model improvements.

References

Bates, P. (1986). Competitive employment in southern Illinois: A transitional service delivery model for enhancing competitive employment outcomes for public school students. In F. R. Rusch (Ed.), Competitive employment: Issues and strategies (pp. 51-64). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Bates, P., & Pancsofar, E. (1981). Longitudinal vocational training for severely handicapped students in the public schools. In R. York, W. K. Schofield, D. J. Donder, D. L. Ryndak, & B. Reguly (Eds.), Organizing and implementing services for students with severe and multiple handicaps: Proceedings from the 1981 Illinois Statewide Institute for Educators of the Severely and Profoundly Handicapped (pp. 105-122). Springfield, IL: Department of Specialized Educational Services, Illinois State Board of Education.

Bates, P., & Pancsofar, E. (1983). Project EARN (Employment and Rehabilitation = Normalization): A competitive employment training program for severely disabled youth in the public schools. British Journal of Mental Subnormality, 29 (57), 97-103.

Bellamy, G. T., Sheehan, M. R., Horner, R. H., & Boles, S. M. (1980). Community programs for severely handicapped adults: An analysis of vocational opportunities. Journal of The Association for the Severely Handicapped, 5 (4), 307-324.

Lagomarcino, T. R. (1986). Community services: Using the supported work model within an adult service agency. In F. R. Rusch (Ed.), Competitive employment: Issues and strategies (pp. 65-76). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Moss, J. W., Dineen, J. P., & Ford, L. H. (1986). University of Washington employment training program. In F. R. Rusch (Ed.), Competitive employment: Issues and strategies (pp. 77-88). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Rusch, F. R. (1983). Competitive vocational training. In M. E. Snell (Ed.), Systematic instruction of the moderately and severely handicapped (2nd ed.) (pp. 503-523). Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.

Rusch, F. R. (1986). Preface. In F. R. Rusch (Ed.), Competitive employment: Issues and strategies (pp. xiii-xv). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Rusch, F. R., & Mithaug, D. E. (1980). Vocational training for mentally retarded adults: A behavior analytic approach. Champaign, IL: Research Press.

Standards for educational and psychological testing. (1985). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Vogelsberg, R. T. (1984). Competitive employment programs for individuals with mental retardation in rural areas. In P. Wehman (Ed.), Proceedings from the national symposium on employment of citizens with mental retardation. Richmond, VA: Virginia Commonwealth University.

Vogelsberg, R. T. (1986). Competitive employment in Vermont. In F. R. Rusch (Ed.), Competitive employment: Issues and strategies (pp. 35-49). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Vogelsberg, R. T., Williams, W. W., & Fox, W. L. (1981). Comprehensive vocational services operational plan. Center for Developmental Disabilities Monograph Series, 2, 1-43.

Wehman, P. (1981). Competitive employment: New horizons for severely disabled individuals. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Wehman, P. (1986). Competitive employment in Virginia. In F. R. Rusch (Ed.), Competitive employment: Issues and strategies (pp. 23-34). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Wehman, P., & Kregel, J. (1985). A supported work approach to competitive employment of individuals with moderate and severe handicaps. The Journal of The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 10, 3-11.

Wilcox, B., & Bellamy, G. T. (1982). Design of high school programs for severely handicapped students. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Case Study Analysis of Three Supported Employment Model Programs: The Community, the Agency, and the Program

Debbie L. Winking
and
Lizanne DeStefano

Community-based employment programs have become increasingly important in the overall service delivery system of adult service agencies. This impetus for change can be attributed to at least three factors in our society.

First, a new type of adult clientele has emerged from public school special education programs. These students possess numerous functional skills fostered by a background rich in community-based training. These young adults and their parents are becoming increasingly dissatisfied with segregated vocational programs and demand their place as integrated independent citizens. Second, a service delivery system that has traditionally not promoted movement of clients through the system has in many cases produced long waiting lists for intake into sheltered workshops. Third, a small number of community-based vocational programs have evolved as a general response to the attitude espoused long ago by proponents of the principle of normalization.

The past 10 to 12 years have seen the development of community-based employment programs that responded to these needs. These programs were designed to provide job-seeking assistance and time-limited training, exclusive of more intensive and long term service. The focus of these programs suited the needs of individuals with mild handicaps who were expected to maintain integrated employment if given initial training and occasional follow-up services. A group of individuals, usually those with training needs of greater intensity, were still deemed inappropriate for work in the community.

Supported employment programs have recently emerged as a powerful employment option for individuals who have for the most part been excluded from community employment because of the severity of their disabilities or behavioral problems.

According to the U.S. Department of Education (1985), the concept of supported employment may be defined as "paid work in a variety of integrated settings, particularly regular work sites, especially designed for severely handicapped individuals irrespective of age or vocational potential." These programs provide ongoing training to persons with severe disabilities who are not expected to succeed in the workplace without continued support. It is because of this degree of permanence at the worksite that the supported employment program has been established as an organization that is an integral part of, and at the same time, an entity outside the physical environs of the adult service agency.

Supported employment programs are unique compared to other vocational service delivery options because of the population they serve and the delicate balance that they must maintain between the needs of the client and those of business and industry in order to provide long-term support. For these reasons, it is important to those in rehabilitation and traditional job placement to analyze these pioneer programs.

The purpose, then, of the case study was to examine in depth three programs involved in the Illinois supported employment initiative. The dynamics of individual programs were analyzed to determine specific factors that might contribute to programmatic success in implementing supported employment and might serve as an aid to agencies interested in replicating supported employment.

Method

The use of a case study format lends itself to a more holistic analysis of the everyday factors and perceptions that might influence program development and that might pass undetected using traditional quantitative measurement approaches. In these particular case studies we utilized three techniques of data collection--interview, agency employee survey, and structured observations. Each of these methods is discussed in detail.

Structured interviews. Structured interviews were conducted with all key stakeholders directly or indirectly involved with

supported employment. In these particular case studies, targeted stakeholders included project coordinators, job trainers, job placement specialists, executive directors, residential management staff, residential direct-care staff, workshop staff, employers, co-workers, workers, and parents. The purpose of these interviews was to assess perception of the supported employment program as it affected each of the above-mentioned groups.

This report is based on 61 interviews conducted across the three participating agencies.

Agency employee survey. A survey was administered to employees of the agency who were not a part of the supported employment program including workshop staff, residential staff, and clerical personnel (see Figure 1). The purpose of this instrument was to survey the knowledge and perceptions of supported employment among agency personnel not involved in supported employment.

Structured observations. Observations were conducted at actual employment sites. These observational periods, which ranged from 45 to 150 minutes in length, focused on the job trainer as representative of not only the program but also the entire agency to community employment sites. A minimum of 15 to 18 hours of structured observation were conducted at each program. These hours were divided among two to three community multiple placement sites. These observations allowed researchers to obtain vital information pertaining to program

Figure 1

AGENCY EMPLOYEE SURVEY

agency/employee code_____

Agency Employee Survey

Position in agency_____How long in current position?_____
How long employed by agency?_____

1) Rate your knowledge of your agency's Supported Employment Program

No knowledge----------High knowledge
1 2 3 4 5

2) In your opinion, which of the following best describes the disability category of individuals served in the supported employment program:

Mild----------Moderate----------Severe
1 2 3 4 5

3) How long have you been aware of the existence of your agency's Supported Employment Program? _____(months; years)
(Circle one)

How much value do you feel the supported employment program has for individuals served as compared to the other vocational programs offered by your agency in terns of the following characteristics:

4) Lower wages earned----------Higher wages earned
1 2 3 4 5

5) Less individualization to client/worker needs----------More Individualization to client/worker needs
1 2 3 4 5

6) Less community integration----------More community integration
1 2 3 4 5

7) At present, what vocational program offered by your agency do you feel has the most impact on individuals served?
Why?_____

8) Do you see the supported program expanding in the next year to play a greater role in the overall agency?

_____yes, supported employment will expand within my agency
_____no, supported employment will not expand within my agency

9) Rate your knowledge of duties involved in the position of job trainer/coach in your agency's supported employment program.

Low knowledge----------High knowledge
1 2 3 4 5

10)Please list what you consider to be the most important duties or tasks for which a job trainer/coach is responsible.

1)_____

2)_____

3)_____

4)_____

How do you feel the position of job trainer/coach compares to the position of floor supervisor or day trainer for the following qualities?

The position of job trainer has _____ compared to a floor supervisor:

11) less prestige----------no difference----------more prestige
1 2 3 4 5

12) Less responsibility----------no difference----------More responsibility
1 2 3 4 5

13) Lower salary----------no difference----------Higher salary
1 2 3 4 5

14) Would you ever consider the position of job coach/job trainer for yourself?

_____ yes _____ no

Why or why not?

_____
_____
_____
_____

Thank You For Your Cooperation.

dynamics at the actual employment sites, as well as to verify data collected during interviews.

Criteria Upon Which Programs Were Chosen

These case studies were conducted with three supported employment programs, including one urban, one rural, and one suburban location chosen according to the following four criteria:

1. programs that had developed multiple placement sites or enclaves (two or more workers with the job trainer),
2. programs that had placed the numbers of workers specified in their grants,
3. programs that approximated the population targeted for service by the initiative (i.e., individuals with severe disabilities),
4. programs scoring in the upper quartile and within 5 points of one another on a degree-of-implementation measure. (The instrument used was developed by Mr. John S. Trach at the University of Illinois).

Program Profiles

Case study 1. Case study 1 was conducted at a suburban program located about 30 miles south of Chicago. The agency includes a workshop, a residential facility, and a school program. This agency had never been involved in community

employment placement before beginning their supported employment grant in May 1985. The grant currently employs a program coordinator, a lead job coach, two full-time job coaches, and a clerical staff person.

The initial supported employment sites were established in February 1986. To date, operational employment sites include two enclaves for food service and bedmaking at a nursing home, a clerical enclave in a large bank, and an individual placement as kitchen worker in another location of the same bank, with a total of nine workers placed at the sites mentioned. Workers in multiple placements range in I.Q. from below 30 to 54.

Case study 2. Case study 2 was conducted in a rural town with a population of approximately 5,000. The agency includes a workshop and a residential facility. This agency had never been involved in community employment before the initiation of the supported employment grant in May 1985.

The grant currently employs a program coordinator and two full-time and one part-time job coaches.

Because of the lack of availability of community employment sites suitable for multiple placements during the early stages of implementation, this program began with individual placements and has gradually moved to serving clients through multiple-placement sites. Although other individual placements were made, this program's first multiple-placement sites were established in September 1986.

These multiple placement sites include janitiorial enclaves

in a survey equipment warehouse, a county department building, and a laundry and janitorial site at a mid-sized nursing home in a neighboring town. A total of 16 workers were placed in these enclaves and individual placement sites. The IQ scores of workers at multiple-placement sites range from 18 to 50, with the exception of one worker whose score is 66.

Case study 3. The third case study was conducted in an urban setting, a city with a population of 200,000, at a comprehensive agency with a workshop and residential facility. Before receiving supported employment funds this agency had some experience in placing clients in community employment through a janitorial training program that provided several weeks of intensive skills training before placing them in janitorial positions.

The grant currently employs a program coordinator, three full-time and two part-time job trainers, and a clerical staff person.

This program's first sites were operational last June. Twenty workers have been placed at the seven multiple-placement sites operational to date, including food service at a large community college, fast-food establishments, laundry service, and two separate clerical enclaves in an insurance company. The IQ scores of these workers range from 28 to 55.

Levels of Analysis

This paper will attempt to aggregate these three case studies to analyze the role of the supported employment program at the individual, agency, and community levels.

The analysis encompasses the current status of perceptions of supported employment today, 18 months after the beginning of the Illinois Supported Employment Inititative, as well as implications for the future.

Analysis at the Program Level

Without question, supported employment was viewed as a successful and powerful program option by job trainers, program coordinators, and others directly involved in the implementation of supported employment.

The program components overwhelmingly cited as most important to a successful supported employment program by coordinators and job trainers were teamwork and communication. In almost all instances staff members state that all roles are equally crucial in a supported employment program.

One job trainer made the following comment about staff roles in her supported employment program:

> I can't say which job is most crucial to a successful supported employment program. We need someone back in the office providing the "glue" --dealing with agencies, state funders, getting funding so that the job trainers can be involved in direct training on-site daily.

and

> Our job titles are just that; we are all equal in the weekly meetings.

When asked to define communication, program personnel explained that this means effective communication at all levels, including across program roles (i.e., job trainer to job placement specialist to program coordinator), and between the program and other key stakeholders (i.e., parents, worker, co-worker, and employer).

Clear communication is evidenced in the degree of understanding staff members have for each other's roles in the delivery of this new employment option. Consistently throughout interviews job trainers could explain accurately the tasks involved in their program coordinator's job and why they were necessary.

Likewise, coordinators were sympathetic to the demanding role of the job trainer. In these particular programs coordinators gave job trainers the necessary autonomy at the site while being careful to establish strong support systems to make job trainers feel less isolated and still a part of the agency. Examples of support systems include allowing job trainers sufficient time to return to the office for paperwork and program planning. Program coordinators also established weekly or biweekly meetings to allow job trainers to report on the status of the various employment sites they manage, as well as to update job trainers on implementation issues, agency policies, and other pertinent concerns. These meetings were a positive avenue for two-way communication between direct service

and administrative staff and were considered essential due to the community-based nature of the programs.

Day-to-day manifestions of this high level of teamwork and communication were evidenced in all three programs, where, for example, the coordinator has done actual training on site to help out in peak times, to provide job trainers with release time, and to cover staff vacations.

Finally, program coordinators and job trainers felt that agency support was definitely top-down support. They emphasized the importance of an involved executive director as a factor in the success of their supported employment program.

Executive directors were perceived by program personnel as performing a number of vital support functions. These support functions include:

1. Endorsing the program within the agency. In this function, the executive director plays an advocate role for the supported employment program within the agency itself. For example, the executive director may give a speech explaining supported employment goals at an agency-wide meeting. Staff of the three programs studied felt that agency staff was more likely to support a program that their executive director actively promoted.
2. Being a public relations person for the program because their positions as chief administrators and figureheads of their agency, executive directors often speak to community organizations such as Rotary clubs, business

advisory councils, and parent groups. These occasions provide excellent opportunities to acquaint these business and consumer groups to new program options such as supported employment.

3. Being an advocate for alternative funding within the agency and through outside sources. Because of their role in supervising the agency budget, executive directors usually have an awareness of other private funding sources, such as Goodwill Industries, which are already being tapped to supplement other programs in the agency, as well as access to other discretionary funds within the agency.

Implications for the Future

Program growth. Supported employment program staff are encouraged by the rapid progress their programs have made in what is essentially the first full year of operational community placement sites. Program personnel were optimistic about the future of supported employment.

Program coordinators and job coaches alike projected that greater numbers of clients would be served through supported employment in the next two years. One vocational coordinator/program director anticipated that 25 of their 50 workshop clients would be placed in the next two years.

Increased independence. All staff members saw increased independence among those workers presently placed. Examples of independence included behaving appropriately in the absence of

the trainer, self-control of inappropriate behaviors that previously interfered with independence in the community, and instances of increased use of public transportation and self-initiated contacts with co-workers. As evidence of a changing locus of control and increased independence, program staff described what they saw as "real desire" on the part of some workers to do things without trainer assistance.

Consumer support. Greater parent and employer cooperation was envisioned for the future as both consumer groups came to see the successes in the community of other SEP workers. Staff felt that in their programs' successes were already becoming contagious. New employers were initiating contacts with the agency to learn more about the supported employment program because they had heard of its success from other employers. Similarily, some parents who had seen former workshop clients in community jobs were becoming increasingly interested in securing a position in the program for their sons or daughters.

Increased job options. Job coaches repeated the hope of securing more "nontraditional" enclaves in the future. In the less industrial setting of the rural community, the target was stock positions in shoe stores and dress shops, whereas in suburban and urban settings, clerical positions in banks and insurance companies were desired.

Improved quality of life. Staff saw supported employment future outcomes as not restricted to the vocational growth of the workers, but as having implications for all aspects of their

lives. As individuals become more competent and more independent, staff anticipated such outcomes as clients moving into less restrictive living arrangements (i.e., movement to group homes from Intermediate Care Facilities ICF/DD) as well as independence in accessing public transportation and recreation facilities.

Potential deterents. Staff members were not without questions when it came to the future of supported employment. Some of the factors that were considered as potential deterrents to the realization of these outcomes included:

1. placement failures in the community, causing renewed parental and employer resistance,
2. lack of adequate funding, causing programs to keep willing employers waiting,
3. need for more staff,
4. the ability of supported employment to attract and hold quality employees at the direct service or job trainer level because of inadequate salary schedules,
5. lack of formalized staff training to prepare trainers to work with the target population,
6. a declining economy,
7. lack of adequate and connecting transportation in suburban and rural programs,

Analysis of Agency Support

Perceptions of success of the supported employment program did not end with direct staff of the program alone. Although these supported employment programs may be considered to be still in their infancy, case study survey and interview results indicated that the impact of the supported employment program was surprisingly strong, even at the agency level.

Perceptions of executive directors. Executive directors were in agreement with job trainers and program coordinators

that commitment and teamwork of program staff were the most important factors in the establishment of supported employment as an innovative and different service option for their agencies.

Directors also cited a "supported employment philosophy" or commonality of purpose within the staff of the program, and an inclination and willingness to work in a nontraditional environment as the most important factors in a successful supported employment program. They felt that supported employment staff could not excite the entire agency to the idea of supported employment unless they had a firm hold on just what their mission was. This philosophy is necessary, one executive director said, " to sell the idea of supported employment to all concerned parties."

Executive directors see supported employment as a good public relations program. One executive director related the following thoughts on the supported employment program's impact on the community:

> Supported employment has almost singlehandedly made us visible to the community . The community sees effective work being accomplished. I am excited because I can now go to the community from a position of strength as opposed to charity.

Although directors see supported employment as a new and exciting option, they commented that it has been difficult at times. In the beginning, one executive director saw supported employment as risky, because it was a program that did not fit

the rules that adult service agencies had traditionally followed. After being involved with the program for more than a year, he now feels that his agency's involvement in supported employment is vitally important from a systems change perspective. He summed up his feelings about the risks involved in initiating a new service option within an existing system as follows:

> If you wait for issues to be resolved you will never go forward. Only by sticking your neck out initially and challenging the existing systems do you see positive change in policies and disincentives. Now that we have been in supported employment and taken some chances are we able to go to the legislators and show them just where the policies may need to be revised. They [the legislators] need a tangible issue to address.

These executive directors see supported employment as a chance to enhance the client's quality of life, as an excellent public relations tool having positive repercussions for all programs within the agency, and as a way of moving individuals through the service system to reduce in-house program waiting lists.

However, this group does not see supported employment as phasing out all other programs in the agency:

> SEP is not "<u>the</u> thing" for us; however, I do see it as a tremendously important component in an array of services.

Program personnel (job coaches, job placement specialists, and program coordinators) have emphasized the importance of a supportive executive director as an advocate for their program.

If this is the case, at least in these agencies the director may be seen as having a special investment in positive supported employment outcomes.

But what about other groups within the agency, having purposes separate from, and traditionally thought to be counter to, the aims of community-based employment? How do directors of day training programs, floor supervisors, agency-run intermediate care facility operators, and direct residential staff feel about supported employment? The next section explores the reactions of these groups to the supported employment programs in their agencies.

Perceptions of agency personnel. Workshop and residential management staff (i.e., directors of Day Training 1 and Day Training 2 programs, agency social workers, directors of residential facility) also cited "110% commitment and teamwork" of program staff as responsible for the current success of supported employment in their agencies.

Specifically, frequency of staffings, coordination of agency individual case counselors with supported employment staff, and a general willingness on the part of job trainers and program coordinators to do "whatever is necessary to make the program work," were cited as evidence of teamwork.

One residential program manager commented that, as a result of supported employment, her residents now had more choices: "Before supported employment, as a client, if you were not interested in janitorial work there just was not much out there

for you."

Although this support had to be earned through allowing agency personnel to see actual successes of community placements, there is evidence that agency employees support this new community employment option.

Future Role of Supported Employment in the Agency

As for the role that supported employment would play in the entire agency in the future, all groups from floor supervisor to residental care staff to executive directors saw the role of supported employment expanding in the next two years.

A significant number of these persons saw supported employment as the focus of programming in the future. However, these were not visions of supported employment as a replacement for all other programming options, but rather a view of supported employment as vital part of all vocational services.

One director of DT2 had this to say about the future relationship of supported employment and her program:

> Although cooperation between the programs has been great up to this point, I would like to see greater integration between the DT2 program and SEP. Our role (the workshop's) for SEP clients would be as an adult education center, just as an adult learning center is for anyone who is employed and seeks further education in the evenings.

This workshop supervisor does not envision her program in jeopardy, but rather providing a needed service in the personal and community development of supported employment workers.

(Similar comments were also made by the director of an intermediate care facility.) Living skills such as budgeting and money management, which are more appropriately practiced in settings other than work, would be supplemented by skills classes offered by the workshop using a continuing-education format.

All agency personnel interviewed indicated that in the future, greater numbers of clients will be served through supported employment. They outlined a situation in which all other programs, including affiliated school and workshop programs, would gradually change their focus to one of preparation for community employment. As more community placement sites are established, supported employment is likely to become a viable option for an increasing number of clients. The ranks of day training programs will change as lower functioning individuals from Day Training 1 (DT1) are funneled into Day Training 2 (DT2) as slots are opened by supported employment candidates. One agency executive director termed supported employment as the long awaited answer to the "log jam" of adult service agencies.

Overall Agency Involvement in the Supported Employment Process

Why do these agency groups seem to be so invested in the concept of supported employment? Interview and survey as well

as observational results seemed to indicate a sense of involvement in the supported employment program by other agency staff.

One might expect feelings of resentment on the part of direct-care staff in the workshop that supported employment was taking all the "good workers," or, similarly, in agency residential facilities, that supported employment created a lot of headaches, extra work, and schedule changes for them just to get clients ready in the mornings for their community jobs.

The consensus of residential and management staff was that this was not the case. Much of this positive attitude seems to be due to the groundwork laid by supported employment program coordinators.

Workshop and residential program managers cited the fact that program coordinators were careful to provide inservice orientation to agency personnel to the concept and philosophy of supported employment. They allowed agency personnel to share in the ownership of the program and in client success by making staff a part of the process used to target potential workers for supported employment. Supported employment program staff kept other agency personnel abreast of client progress in the program, either on a formal or informal basis. In this way, if a floor supervisor could not claim direct responsibility for a new supported employment candidate's success at a community job site, at least he or she could feel a part of the process used to target that individual for services. These perceptions of

involvement are evidenced in the following quotation from an administrator:

> All administrators of all units were involved from the very beginning, allowed to give input. We are invited to staffings. We don't see it as a separate program but as part of the team.

Another positive strategy that was reported to enhance agency support was allowing supported employment workers to visit the agency after being successfully placed on a community job. A day-training assistant director commented on how important it was to her when SEP workers came back to the workshop to visit, because then she was able to see the progress made through her initial efforts in preparing individuals for supported employment.

Strategies used by program coordinators to involve agency personnel varied among the programs studied. One program offered a monetary incentive to anyone in the agency who provided a job lead that resulted in an employment site. Other programs provided agencywide inservices. Each of these activities was planned to achieve a common goal, that is, fostering a sense of ownership for the supported employment program within the agency at large; this implies a client-needs-based approach to service delivery which is often espoused as an agency philosophy. However, because supported employment is a new and different program option and is not based within the walls of the agency, extra preparation may be necessary to gain support and to allow agency staff to feel the same degree of

ownership that they may feel for other programs within the agency.

Results of the Agency Employee Survey parallel the comments of management staff that in fact direct service personnel in the agency did support the Supported Employment Program. Even though the program is relatively new (operational sites just beginning within the last year), in all three case studies agency personnel cited supported employment 57%, 78%, and 50% of the time (with a mean of 63%) as the vocational program having the most impact on individuals served in the entire agency (Table 1).

These positive attitudes are further highlighted by the fact that all those surveyed stated that they anticipated that in the future, supported employment would play a greater role in the overall agency. One might conclude from these results that if agency staff did not feel that SEP was having the greatest impact at the present time, they all saw it as having a growing role in the future.

Respondents felt that supported employment offered greater individualization, more integration, and higher wages than other vocational programs offered by the agency (Table 2).

The answers of employees to the survey questions reflect some degree of understanding of the philosophy and goals of their agency's supported employment program and underscore the importance of increasing understanding of supported employment within the entire agency.

Table 1

Agency Employee Survey

Perceptions of Agency Employees
About the Supported Employment Program

	AGENCY			MEAN
	1	2	3	
	%	%	%	%
Which vocational program offered by your agency has the most impact on individuals served				
SEP	57	78	50	63
Workshop	43	22	50	37
Will supported employment play a greater role in your agency in the future?				
Yes	88	100	100	95
No	0	0	0	0
No Opinion	1			

N = 33

Table 2

Agency Employee Survey

Mean responses of Agency Employees Concerning the Value of Supported Employment Compared to Other Agency Programs

Question: How much value do you feel supported employment has to individuals served compared to other vocational programs offered by your agency? Please rate your answer on a scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high).

	AGENCY			TOTAL
	1	2	3	
Wages earned	4.8	4.3	4.3	4.5
Individual-ization to client needs	4.4	4.4	4.8	4.5
Community integration	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8

N = 33

Analysis at the Community Level

Of course, since community integration is integral to to the concept of supported employment, we cannot ignore community perceptions of these programs.

This concept of the term community may be defined on three levels: a) employers and co-workers, b) parents as an invested extension of the program, and c) the communty resident viewpoint.

Community support. Most of those staff members interviewed felt that it was too early to get a clear indication of support at the community resident level. However, all program staff did say that they had never experienced an outward sign of dismay or shock on the part of the community to the workers that they were training.

This may be due partly to the public relations work and exposure given to the program through the efforts of supported employment personnel. Public relations techniques used to heighten public awareness of supported employment for persons with severe disabilities include contacting the local chamber of commerce, press releases, TV and radio spots featuring supported employment, and coverage of employer appreciation banquets.

These marketing strategies have dual benefit for programs. First, they heighten public awarness, and second, they provide recognition and publicity for employers who are partcipating in the supported employment initiative. For example, employers

noted that after a television special, a radio spot, or a news article was released, many customers would comment about how great the special was, or what a worthy program they must be sponsoring.

Employer Support. The interaction between the employer and co-worker in the supported employment process is essential in any discussion of community perceptions of such programs.

All employers served by these employment programs were in favor of expanding supported employment. Some were actively trying to recruit more supported employment individuals for already-established enclaves, while others felt that although there were no more slots available in their employ, they would recommend the supported employment arrangement to other businesses and companies.

In almost all cases, favorable attitudes toward expansion were based on a single criterion, success. One employer said that the positive accomplishments of an earlier supported employment placement had allowed expansion into her unit of the bank. "As long as we continue to have success, why not?" she said.

What did these employers feel was essential to successful supported employment in their businesses? Again the answer was the support and commitment of the entire supported employment staff. Employers were particularly reassured that through the collective efforts of the worker, the job trainer, and the program coordinator, the job would get done. Many commented that

they had seen a program coordinator come in, roll up his or her sleeves, and assist with training if the regular job trainer was absent. According to employers, they felt that in supported employment they had finally found a social service program in which staff as well as the program itself were truly geared to their production needs.

Almost all the employers interviewed admitted that in the beginning they had had some reservations about hiring persons with severe disabilities.

One employer felt that when the program was explained to her by the job developer, it was too good to be true. "Support at the site at all times? None of her regular supervisors' time would be spent to train this new group?" It was hard to believe. But after months in the program she saw that the initial promises of continued support and supervision were delivered. Her reservations about workers with disabilities were disspelled as she actually saw the job getting done.

Comments reflected positive attitudes toward not only the program in general, but also the workers themselves. One direct supervisor commented of her supported employment workers who had been on the job for nearly a year:

> Now I sometimes forget that they are handicapped and I begin spouting off commands. This group is part of the kitchen team. At first I thought we'd hit a plateau with them, that there would be only so much they could handle. However, I find that I am able to continuously increase their duties and responsibilities. I treat them all the same. They get the same privleges and reprimands as everyone else.

And a co-worker voiced the initial feelings of his peers toward workers with severe disabilities:

> A lot of people have a hard time getting over the fact that people are different. However, when we learned that they [the SEP workers] would be working on our floor, we had to respect them for the job they do, just as we do all the aides and nurses. They are legitimate workers here, and they make everyone's job easier.

Parent support. Parents too were encouraged by the success of their sons and daughters. Although many could not explain the specific activities involved in the training conducted with their adult sons and daughters, they were particularly reassured by the frequent contacts and support provided by program personnel. All three programs had weekly contact with the parents or the residential facility or both. To obtain an additional measure of parental/residental satisfaction, one program required parents to complete an evaluation of the degree to which the supported employment program was meeting their needs.

Finally, all parents interviewed expressed a sense of satisfaction that their sons or daughters were included in a unique program that offered a real job in the community.

> They [the program staff] told us that they wanted her to go out in to the community; at first I did not think she would be able to do it. They promised that there would be someone there all the time. So I trusted the program staff, and they were right. She is happier now than she has ever been, and when she gets home from work, she always has something new to talk about.

> Since Joe has been in the program we have watched the progress. It is the greatest thing

> that ever happened to him. Now Joe has goals when he wakes up in the mornings, He tells us he wants to work faster, and better, than the day before and be more independent of his trainer every day.

Future Implications

What conclusions may be derived from this case study analysis of three community employment programs? First of all, these results begin to demonstrate the level of commitment and teamwork necessary to launch a new program option like supported employment successfully.

Communication and public-relations work are necessary within the agency and with employers, parents, and the community at large. Since by the very nature of supported employment the program becomes highly visible to the public, the program coordinator and especially the job trainer come to represent in the eyes of the community not only the program but the entire adult service agency.

As chief communicators to key stakeholders in the supported employment process, job trainers and program coordinators have some unique responsibilities as well as advantages. They must respond continually to the changing needs and production demands of the business community, which requires a working knowledge of business terminology and philosophy. However, they must balance the employer's needs with the needs of their number one constituents, the workers with developmental disabilities and their parents. Overwhelmingly evident was the importance of

making as many groups as possible in the agency aware and invested in the supported employment program. This duty of the program staff of laying the groundwork within the agency and of making supported employment an integral part of all services cannot be ignored.

The philosophy of a client-needs-based atmosphere that stresses the maximum growth potential of the individual, already espoused by many adult service agencies, must be extended to new community-based service options, such as supported employment. To foster ownership of the supported employment program, agency personnel must be made aware of the goals of the program and must be involved in the process of supported employment. This involvement may be of varying degrees, including general agency awareness programs, inclusion of other agency groups in supported employment program staffings, soliciting input from agency staff in targeting worker referrals, and possibly allowing agency staff a share in job development activities.

Finally, this study underscores the need to recognize executive directors as essential to the continued success of supported employment programs. The support of the executive director is necessary to lay the overall structure for supported employment, to provide adequate public relations for the program, to secure financial support, and to run interference against any counter forces inside or outside the agency.

References

Trach, J.S. & Rusch, F.R. (1987). Validation of an instrument for evaluating supported employment program: The degree of implementation. (This volume).

Department of Education. Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services. (1987, May 27). State Supported Employment Services Program; Notice of Proposed Rulemaking. Federal Register, 52 (101), 19816-19820.

ISEP
Funded Projects

Date/Time Staff	Facility and Address	Contact Person	Region & Agency
6/16 9:00 DW	Aid to Retarded Citizens Inc. 2719 S. 11th St. Springfield, IL 62703	Mark Schneider Patrick Wear, II Executive Director (217-789-2560)	3 DMH/DD (411)
6/12 9:00 JST	Ctr. for Disabled Student Serv. Chicago City-Wide College 226 W. Jackson, 6th Floor Chicago, IL 60606	Dan Woodyatt Sally Vernon Director (312-641-2595)	5B DMH/DD (370)
6/26 9:00 JST	The Center for Rehabilitation and Training of the Disabled 6610 N. Clark St. Chicago, IL 60626	Carol Woodworth (312-929-8200) Cathy Lorber, Ph.D. Stuart G. Ferst Executive Director (312-973-7900)	5A DMH/DD (403)
*6/3 9:00 DW/JT	Chicago Assoc. for Retarded Citizens 8562 S. Vincennes Chicago, IL 60620	Robert Lewis Carolyn B. Thompson Dir. of Placement Services (312-651-3720)	5B DMH/DD (401)
6/15 9:00 JST	Comprehensive Services Box 428 Mt. Vernon, IL 62864	Sharon Smith John Metcalf Rehab. Director (618-242-7300)	4 DMH/DD (231)
6/12 9:00 JT	Developmental Services Ctr. 1304 W. Bradley Avenue Champaign, IL 61821	Carole Powers Rick Krandel Dale Morrisey Chief Executive Officer (217-356-9176)	3 DMH/DD (422)
6/22 9:00 DW	Effingham Association for Retarded Citizens 618 W. Main St. Teutopolis, IL 62467	Michael Poe Michael W. Fortner Executive Director (217-857-3186)	4 DMH/DD (475)
6/9 9:00 JT	El Valor Corporation 1850 W. 21st St. Chicago, IL 60608	Nina Martino Gloria Morales Curtin Dir. of Adult Services (312-666-4511)	5B DMH/DD (539)
6/19 9:00 DW	Employer Resource Service/Arrise 9790 Allen Street Rosemont, IL 60018	Rosalie Mattern James Johnson Executive Director (312-771-2945) (312-671-5877)	2 DMH/DD (363)

(9-10-87)

Date/Time Staff	Facility and Address	Contact Person	Region & Agency
6/16 9:00 JST	Franklin-Williamson Workshop 902 W. Main St. West Frankfort, IL 62896	Jeff Horton Gail Kear Executive Director (618-983-5421) (618-937-6483)	1 DORS (234)
6/15 9:00 JT	Happiday Centers, Inc. 1005 W. End Ave. Chicago Heights, IL 60411	Diane Alexander Jim Kompik Patrick O'Brien Executive Director (312-755-8030)	6 DMH/DD (570)
6/22 9:00 JT	Iroquois ARC Box 324 Watseka, IL 60970	Roberta Ioder Louellen Strong Executive Director (815-432-5288) (815-432-6191) SEP Office	3 DMH/DD (140)
6/16 9:00 JT	Job Resources for the Disabled 3140 N. Cambridge Chicago, IL 60657	Andy Tayaka Ms. Michael Rooney Executive Director (312-327-4412)	5 DORS (337)
*6/23 9:00 DW	Lake County Society for Human Development 3441 Sheridan Road Zion, IL 60099	Linda Milz Randy R. Ross Executive Director (312-872-1700)	2 DMH/DD (419)
*6/2 9:00 JST/JT	The Lambs, Inc. P.O. Box 520 Libertyville, IL 60048	Julie Metzger Gerald Y. Friedman Executive Director (312-362-4636 or 361-3320)	2 DMH/DD (391)
6/30 9:00 JST	McDonough Co. Rehab. Ctr. 900 S. Deer Road Macomb, IL 61422	Mary Fran Jim Starnes President (309-837-4876)	1 DMH/DD (364)
6/30 9:00 JT	North Shore Association for the Retarded 7855 K Gross Point Road Skokie, IL 60077	Pat Baer Gerald Gully Executive Director (312-869-5515)	2 DMH/DD (422)
6/18 9:00 JST	Occupational Development Ctr. 400 N. East St. Bloomington, IL 61701	Paula Knutson Lyn Hyrska Tomm Foss Executive Director (309-828-7324)	3 DMH/DD (451)

Date/Time Staff	Facility and Address	Contact Person	Region & Agency
6/9 9:00 DW	Open Door Rehab. Ctr. 208 Beaver Street Yorkville, IL 60560	Steve Stricker Marilyn Barman Executive Director (312-553-9222)	2 DMH/DD (671)
6/8 9:00 JST	Opportunity House, Inc. 202 Lucas St. P.O. Box 301 Sycamore, IL 60178	Peter Bauman John R. Kroos Executive Director (815-895-5108)	1 DMH/DD (344)
6/10 9:00 JST	Orchard Village 7670 Marmora Skokie, IL 60077	Jack McAllister Vocational Director John Winke Executive Director (312-967-1800)	2 DMH/DD (576)
6/18 9:00 JT	Park Lawn 5340 W. 111th St. Oak Lawn, IL 60453	Brother Frank Portada Coord. of Voc. Services Jim Weiss Executive Director (312-424-8616)	6 DMH/DD (431)
6/8 10:00 JT	Ray Graham Association 420 W. Madison St. Elmhurst, IL 60126	Julie Seta James DeOre Executive Director (312-543-2440)	6 DMH/DD (407)
6/10 10:00 DW	Seguin Services Inc. 3145 S. 55th Avenue Cicero, IL 60650	Bob Brocken Rick Miller Executive Director (312-863-3803)	2 DMH/DD (420)
6/11 9:00 JST	Special Education Parents Alliance 305 22nd St., Suite K-164 Glen Ellyn, IL 60137	Steve Tenpas Marjorie Lee President (312-790-3060)	5 DORS
*6/1 9:00 DW	Spectrum Vocational Serv. 2302 Wisconsin Downers Grove, IL 60515	Beth Anderson Peggy White Associate Director (312-852-7520) (312-355-6533)	6 DMH/DD (459)
6/17 9:00 DW/JST	Victor C. Neumann Assoc. 2354 N. Milwaukee Chicago, IL 60647	Susan Berns Baron Ilene Rosenberg Dir. of Vocational Serv. Carl M. LaMell Executive Director (312-235-6004)	5A DMH/DD (135)

Date/Time Staff	Facility and Address	Contact Person	Region & Agency
6/29 9:00 JST	Warren Achievement Ctr. 1314 S. Main St. Monmouth, IL 61462	Mike Streight Jo McVey President (309-734-8331)	1 DMH/DD (428)
6/23 8:00 JT	Cornerstone Services Inc./ Will County Sheltered Workshop 2401 W. Jefferson Joliet, IL 60435	Cindy Lapicki Don Hespell James Hogan Executive Director (815-744-7204)	6 DMH/DD (487)

Supported Employment Publications List

Thank you for expressing interest in Supported Employment.

The following publications are available from the Illinois Supported Employment Program. Please indicate the publications you are interested in receiving by entering a (✓) next to each article on the enclosed order form. Please be sure to total the cost of each publication (current costs are figured at 5¢ per page), add to this total the cost of mailing, and forward a check to:

Illinois Supported Employment Program
College of Education
University of Illinois
110 Education Building
1310 South Sixth Street
Champaign, IL 61820

SE1977a	Connis, R. T., Sowers, J., Thompson, L. E., & Rusch, F. R. (1977). Training retarded adults for competitive employment. Forum for Behavior Technology, 2, 6-8.	4
SE1977b	Rusch, F. R., Connis, R. T., Sowers, J. (1977). An experimental analysis of a response cost token economy in an applied restaurant setting. Scandinavian Journal of Behavior Therapy, 6, Supp. 4., 115.	1
SE1978	Rusch, F. R., Connis, R. T., & Sowers, J. (1978). The modification and maintenance of time spent attending to task using social reinforcement, token reinforcement and response cost in an applied restaurant setting. Journal of Special Education Technology, 2, 18-26	4
SE1979a	Rusch, F. R. (1979). Toward the validation of social/vocational survival skills. Mental Retardation, 17, 143-144.	2
SE1979b	Schutz, R. P., Rusch, F. R., & Lawson, D. S. (1979). Evaluation of an employer's procedure to eliminate unacceptable behavior on the job. Community Services Forum, 1, 5-6.	1
SE1979c	Rusch, F. R. (1979). A functional analysis of the relationship between attending and producing in a vocational training program. The Journal of Special Education, 13, 399-411.	6

SE1979d Rusch, F. R., & Schutz, R. P. (1979). Non-sheltered employment of the mentally retarded adult: Research to reality? Journal of Contemporary Business. 8, 85-98. 5

SE1979e Sowers, J., Rusch, F. R., & Hudson, C. (1979). Training a severely mentally retarded young adult to ride a city bus to and from work. AAESPH Review, 4, 15-23. 3

SE1980a Sowers, J., Rusch, F. R., Connis, R. T., & Cummings, L. E. (1980). Teaching mentally retarded adults to time manage in a vocational setting. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 13, 119-128. 5

SE1980b Rusch, F. R., Weithers, J. A., Menchetti, B. M., & Schutz, R. P. (1980). Social validation of a program to reduce topic repetition in a non-sheltered setting. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 15, 208-215. 4

SE1980c Connis, R. T., & Rusch, F. R. (1980). Programming maintenance through sequential withdrawal of social contingencies. Behavior Research of Severe Developmental Disabilities, 1, 249-260. 4

SE1980d Rusch, F. R., & Mithaug, D. E. (1980). Vocational training for mentally retarded adults: A behavior analytic approach. Champaign, Illinois, Research Press, 1980, 223 pp. (2612 N. Mattis Ave., Champaign Illinois 61820, 217-352-3273).

SE1980e Rusch, F. R. (1980). Reaction to "Work productivity and the developmentally disabled." In J. A. Leach (Ed.), Productivity in the workforce: A search for perspective, pp. 89-92. Champaign, IL: Office of Vocational Education, Department of Vocational and Technical Education, College of Education, University of Illinois. 2

SE1980f Rusch, F. R., Rusch, J. C., Menchetti, B. M., & Schutz, R. P. (1980). Survey Train-Place: Vocational preparation for the severely handicapped student. Unpublished manuscrip . 12

SE1981a Rusch, F. R., & Schutz, R. P. (1981). Vocational and social work behavior: An evaluative review. In J. L. Matson and J. R. McCartney (Eds.), Handbook of behavior modification with the mentally retarded. New York: Plenum Press, pp. 247-280. 9

SE1981b Schutz, R. P., Jostes, K. F., Rusch, F. R., & Lawson, D. S. (1981). The use of contingent pre-instruction and social validation in the acquisition, generalization, and maintenance of sweeping and mopping responses. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 15, 306-311. 3

SD1981c Rusch, F. R., & Menchetti, B. M. (1981). Increasing compliant work behaviors in a non-sheltered setting. Mental Retardation, 19, 107-112. 2

SE1981d Menchetti, B. M., Rusch, F. R., & Lawson, D. S. (1981). Employers' perceptions of acceptable procedures for use in competitive employment settings. Journal of the Association for the Severely Handicapped, 6, 6-16. 5

SE1981e Schneider, K., Rusch, F. R., Henderson, R. A., & Geske, T. G. (1981). Competitive employment for mentally retarded persons: Costs versus benefits. In William Halloran (Ed.), Funding and cost analysis (Policy paper series: Document 8), Urbana-Champaign, Illinois: Leadership Training Institute - Vocational and Special Education, University of Illinois. Reprinted in: Interchange, March, 1-6. 9

SE1981f Schneider, K. E., Martin, M. E., & Rusch, F. R. (1981). Are we sacrificing quality? Costs versus benefits of sheltered and non-sheltered vocational training programs. Counterpoint, November, 1 and 28. 3

SE1981g Rusch, F. R., & Kazdin, A. E. (1981). Toward a methodology of withdrawal designs for the assessment of response maintenance. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 14, 131-140. 3

SE1981h Menchetti, B. M., & Rusch, F. R. (1981). An analysis of student teacher instructional delivery behavior in post-secondary settings. B. C. Journal of Special Education, 6, 149-158. 10

SE1982a Schutz, R. P., & Rusch, F. R. (1982). Competitive employment: Toward employment integration for mentally retarded persons. In K. L. Lynch, W. E. Kiernan, & J. A. Stark (Eds.), Prevocational and vocational education for special needs youth. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishers, pp. 133-159. 10

SE1982b Karlan, G. R., & Rusch, F. R. (1982). Analyzing the relationship between acknowledgement and compliance in a non-sheltered work setting. Education and Training of Mentally Retarded, 17, 202-208. 4

SE1982c Martin, J. E., Schneider, K. E., Rusch, F. R., & Geske, T. G. (1982). Training mentally retarded individuals for competitive employment: Benefits of transitional employment. Exceptional Education Quarterly, 3, 58-66. 5

SE1982d Rusch, F. R., Schutz, R. P., & Agran, M. (1982). Validating entry-level survival skills for service occupations: Implications for curriculum development. Journal of the Association for the Severely Handicapped, 7, 32-41. 5

SE1982e Rusch, F. R., Schutz, R. P., Mithaug, D. E., Stewart, J. E., & Mar, D. (1982). Vocational assessment and curriculum guide. Seattle, Washington: Exceptional Education. (P.O. Box 15308, Seattle, Washington 98115).

SE1982f Karlan, G. R., & Rusch, F. R. (1982). Correspondence between saying and doing: Some thoughts on defining correspondence and future directions for application. Journal of Applied Behavior, 15, 151-162. 6

SE1982g Martin, J. E., Rusch, F. R., James, V. L., Decker, P. L., & Trtol, K. A. (1982). The use of picture cues to establish self-control in the preparation of complex meals by mentally retarded adults. Applied Research in Mental Retardation, 3, 105-119. 8

SE1983a Rusch, F. R. (1983). Competitive vocational training. In M. Snell (Ed.), Systematic instruction of the moderately and severely handicapped, 2nd Edition. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., pp. 503-523. 10

SE1983b Rusch, F. R., Schutz, R. P., & Heal, L. W. (1983). Vocational training and placement. J. L. Matson & J. A. Mulick (Eds.), Handbook of mental retardation. New York: Pergamon Press, pp. 455-466. 6

SD1983c Menchetti, B. M., Rusch, F. R., & Owens, D. (1983). Assessing the vocational needs of mentally retarded adolescents and adults. In Johnny L. Matson & Stephen E. Breuning (Eds.), Assessing the mentally retarded. New York: Grune & Stratton, Inc., pp. 247-284. 15

SE1983d Rusch, F. R. (1983). Evaluating the degree of concordance between observers' versus employers' evaluations of work behavior. Applied Research in Mental Retardation, 4, 95-102. 4

SE1983e White, D. M., & Rusch, F. R. (1983). Social validation in competitive employment: Evaluating work performance. Applied Research in Mental Retardation, 4, 343-354. 6

SE1983f Mori, A. A., Rusch, F. R., & Fair, G. W. (1983). Guidelines and best practices: Special populations--moderately/severely handicapped. (Personnel development series), Urbana-Champaign, IL: Leadership Training Institute--Vocational and Special Education, University of Illinois. 92

SE1984a Rusch, F. R., & Mithaug, D. E. (1985). Competitive employment education: A systems-analytic approach to transitional programming for the student with severe handicaps. K. Charlie Lakin & R. M. Bruininks (Eds.). Strategies for achieving community integration of developmentally disabled citizens, pp. 177-192. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co. 8

SE1984b Gifford, J. L., Rusch, F. R., Martin, F. R., & White, D. M. (1984). Autonomy and adaptability in work behavior of retarded clients. In Normal R. Ellis & Norman W. Bray (Eds.), International review of research in mental retardation, Volume 12, pp. 285-318, Academic Press. 17

SE1984c Rusch, F. R., Menchetti, B. M., Crouch, K., Riva, M., Morgan, T., & Agran, M. (1984). Competitive employment: Assessing employee reactivity to naturalistic observation. Applied Research in Mental Retardation, 5, pp. 339-351. 7

SE1984d Chadsey-Rusch, J. C., Karlan, G. R., Riva, M. T., & Rusch, F. R. (1984). Competitive employment: Teaching conversational skills to mentally retarded adults in employment settings. Mental Retardation, 22 (5), 218-225. 4

SE1984e Rusch, F. R., Chadsey-Rusch, J., White, D. M., & Gifford, J. L. (1985). Programs for severely mentally retarded adults: Perspectives and methodologies. In D. Bricker & J. Filler (Eds.). Severe mental retardation: From theory to practice, (pp. 119-140). Reston, Virginia: Council for Exceptional Children. 11

SE1984f Rusch, F. R., Gifford, J. L., & Chadsey-Rusch, J. (1985). Behavioral training strategies and applied research in competitive employment. In Sherril Moon, Patricia Goodall, Paul Wehman (Eds.). Critical Issues Related to Supported Competitive Employment: Proceedings from the first RRTC symposium on employment for citizens who are mentally retarded, pp. 82-99. Richmond, VA: Rehabilitation Research and Training Center, School of Education, Virginia Commonwealth University. 18

SE1985a Crouch, K. P., Rusch, F. R., & Karlan, G. P. (1984). Competitive employment: Utilizing the correspondence training paradigm to enhance productivity. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 19 (4), 268-275. 4

SE1985b Rusch, F. R., Morgan, T. K., Martin, J. E., Riva, M., & Agran, M. (in press). Competitive employment: Teaching mentally retarded adults self-instructional strategies. Applied Research in Mental Retardation, 6, 389-407. 10

SE1985c Rusch, F. R. (1985). Glossary of dependent measures from the Employment Training Project. Unpublished manuscript. 26

SE1985d Rusch, F. R., Martin, J. E., & White, D. M. (1985). Competitive employment: Teaching mentally retarded employees to maintain their work behavior. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 20, 182-189. 4

SE1985e Rusch, F. R. (Ed.). (1986). Competitive employment issues and strategies. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co. (P.O. Box 10624, Baltimore, Maryland 21204, 301-377-0883).

SE1985f Martin, J. E., Rusch, F. R., Tines, J. A., Brulle, A. R., & White, D. M. (1985). Work attendance in competitive employment: Comparison between nonhandicapped and mentally retarded employees. Mental Retardation, 23 (3), 142-147. 8

SE1985g Rusch, F. R. & Chadsey-Rusch, J. (1985). Employment for persons with severe handicaps: Curriculum development and coordination of services. Focus on Exceptional Children, 17 (9), 1-8. 13

SE1985h Rusch, F. R. (1985). Introduction to supported work. Paper presented to the Illinois Transition Conference, Springfield, IL., November 18 and 19. 1985. 32

SE1986a Martin, J. E., Rusch, F. R., Lagomarcino, T., & Chadsey-Rusch, J. (in press). Comparison between workers who are nonhandicapped and mentally retarded: Why they lose their jobs. Applied Research in Mental Retardation. 15

SE1986b Trach, J. S., & Rusch, F. R. (in press). Research and trends in employment of adolescents with handicaps. Manuscript submitted for publication. In E. Cipani (Ed.), Child and youth services. 12

SE1986c Lagomarcino, T. R., & Rusch, F. R. (in press). Competitive employment: Overview and analysis of research focus. In Van Hassett, V. B., Strain, P. S., & Hersen, M. (Eds.). Handbook of developmental and physical disabilities. New York: Pergamon Press. 12

SE1986d Maxwell, C. H., Rusch, F. R., Chadsey-Rusch, J., & Renzaglia, A. (1986). Reported factors contributing to job terminations of individuals with severe disabilities. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 11 (1), 45-52. 4

SE1986e Gifford, J. L., Wilson, J. W., & Rusch, F. R. (in press). Vocational rehabilitation. In Gualtieri, C. T., Schroeder, S. R., & Keppel, J. M. (Eds.). Psychiatric treatment for mentally retarded people. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press. 21

SE1986f Chadsey-Rusch, J. G., & Rusch, F. R. (in press). Habilitation programs for mentally retarded persons with severe behavior problems. In R. P. Barrett (Ed.), Treatment of severe behavior disorders: Contemporary approaches with the mentally retarded. New York: Plenum Press. 40

SE1986g Agran, M., & Rusch, F. R. (in press). Career and competitive employment education. In Diane Dietz & Johnny L. Matson (Eds.), Introduction to mental retardation. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman Co. 28

SE1987c Rusch, F. R., Chadsey-Rusch, J., & Lagomarcino, T. (1986). Preparing students for employment. In Snell, M. (Ed.). Systematic instruction for the moderately/severely handicapped (3rd Edition). (pp. 471-490). Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill. 54

SE1987b Hanley-Maxwell, C., Rusch, F. R., & Rappaport, J. (in press). An ecological perspective of job terminations for adults with handicaps. Rehabilitation Counselling Bulletin. 26

SE1987c Martin, J. E.,. & Rusch, F. R. (in press). Use of the partial-sequential withdrawal design to assess maintenance of mentally retarded adults' acquired meal preparation skills. Research in Developmental Disabilities. 22

SE1987d Rusch, F. R., Martin, J. E., Lagomarcino, T. R., & White, D. M. (in press). Teaching task sequencing utilizing the correspondence paradigm. Education and Training in Mental Retardation. 26

SE1987e Menchetti, B. M., & Rusch, F. R. (1987). An analysis of select psychometric properties of the vocational assessment and curriculum guide. Unpublished manuscript. 40

SE1987f Menchetti, B. M., & Rusch, F. R. (in press). Vocational evaluation and eligibility for rehabilitation services. In P. Wehman & S. Moon (Eds.), Vocational rehabilitation and supported employment. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing. 29

SE1987g Rusch, F. R., & Phelps, L. A. (1987). Secondary special education and transition from school to work: A national priority. Exceptional Children, 53, 487-492. 4

SE1987h Rusch, F. R., McNair, J., & DeStefano, L. (1987). Research priorities in secondary special education and transitional services: A national survey. Unpublished manuscript. 26

SE1987i Rusch, F. R., Schutz, R. P., Trach, J., Winking, D., Tines, J., & Heal, L. (1987). Supported employment in Illinois. Unpublished manuscript. 8

SE1987j McNair, J., Trach, J. S., Lagomarcino, T. R., & Rusch, F. R. (1986). Steps to employment: The supported employment model. Unpublished manuscript. 17

SE1987k Rusch, F. R., & Minch, K. E. (in press). Identification of coworker involvement in supported employment: A review and analysis. Research in Developmental Disabilities. 25

SE1988a Chadsey-Rusch, J., & Rusch, F. R. (in press). The ecology of the workplace. In R. Gaylord-Ross (Ed). Vocational education for persons with special needs. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield Publishing. 37

SE1988b Rusch, F. R., McKee, M., Chadsey-Rusch, J., & Renzaglia, A. (in press). Teaching a student with severe handicaps to self instruct: A brief report. Education and Training in Mental Retardation. 19

SE1988c Lagomarcino, T. R., Trach, J. S., Rusch, F. R., & McNair, J. (in press). Overview of practices and emerging trends in employment services. In R. Barrett & J. L. Matson (Eds.). Developmental disabilities: A life span approach. New York: Grune and Stratton. 30

SE1988d Rusch, F. R., & Menchetti, B. M. (in press). Transition in the 1990's: A reply to Knowlton and Clark. Exceptional Children. 7

SE1988e Trach, J. S., & Rusch, F. R. (1988). The supported employment model degree of implementation: A correlational analysis of its validity and relationship to selected outcomes. Unpublished manuscript. 31

SE1988f DeStefano, L. (1988). The use of standardized assessment in supported employment programs. Unpublished manuscript. 52

SE1988g Chadsey-Rusch, J., & Gonzalez, P. (in press). Social ecology of the workplace: Employers' perceptions versus observation. Research in Developmental Disabilities. 32

The costs listed to the right of each order line on the bottom of this page are for the cost of copies only. The number of pages in each article are to the right of each entry on the bibliography list. Total the number of pages you have ordered and check the mailing cost chart. Add that cost to the total cost of copies of the articles you have checked and make your check payable to: University of Illinois. Send the order form and your check to the address on the front of the bibliography listing and you will receive your materials in approximately two weeks.

# of pages	mailing cost
1-5	.56
6-15	.88
16-30	.88
31-45	1.08
46-100	1.90
101-150	2.21
151-215	2.54

Total # of pages ordered _____
Mailing cost (from chart) _____
Total cost of copies + _____
= _____

Please check the materials you would like to have sent.

SE1977a _____20¢
SE1977b _____05¢
SE1978 _____20¢
SE1979a _____10¢
SE1979b _____05¢
SE1979c _____30¢
SE1979d _____25¢
SE1979e _____15¢
SE1980a _____25¢
SE1980b _____20¢
SE1980c _____20¢
SE1980d _____a.f.p*
SE1980e _____10¢
SE1980f _____60¢
SE1981a _____45¢
SE1981b _____15¢
SE1981c _____10¢
SE1981d _____25¢
SE1981e _____45¢
SE1981f _____15¢
SE1981g _____15¢
SE1981h _____50¢
SE1982a _____50¢
SE1982b _____20¢
SE1982c _____25¢
SE1982d _____25¢
SE1982e _____a.f.p*
SE1982f _____30¢
SE1982g _____40¢
SE1983a _____50¢
SE1983b _____30¢
SE1983c _____75¢
SE1983d _____20¢
SE1983e _____20¢
SE1983f _____$4.60
SE1984a _____40¢
SE1984b _____85¢
SE1984c _____35¢
SE1984d _____20¢
SE1984e _____55¢
SE1984f _____90¢
SE1985a _____20¢
SE1985b _____50¢
SE1985c _____$1.30
SE1985d _____20¢
SE1985e _____a.f.p*
SE1985f _____40¢
SE1985g _____65¢
SE1985h _____$1.60
SE1986a _____75¢
SE1986b _____60¢
SE1986c _____60¢
SE1986d _____20¢
SE1986e _____$1.05
SE1986f _____$2.00
SE1986g _____$1.40
SE1987a _____$2.70
SE1987b _____$1.30
SE1987c _____$1.10
SE1987d _____$1.30
SE1987e _____$2.00
SE1987f _____$1.45
SE1987g _____20¢
SE1987h _____$1.30
SE1987i _____40¢
SE1987j _____85¢
SE1987k _____$1.25
SE1988a _____$1.85
SE1988b _____95¢
SE1988c _____$1.50
SE1988d _____35¢
SE1988e _____$1.55
SE1988f _____$2.60
SE1988g _____$1.60

*available from publisher

Illinois Supported Employment Project Staff

Frank Rusch.....Project Director

John Trach.....Technical Assistance

Debbie Winking.....Seminar Series and Annual Meeting

Jeffrey Tines.....Cost-Benefit Analysis

Research Faculty at the University of Illinois

Janis Chadsey-Rusch
Assistant Professor of
Special Education

Lizanne DeStefano
Assistant Professor of
Educational Psychology

Jane Dowling
Assistant Professor of
Special Education

James W. Halle
Associate Professor of
Special Education

Delwyn L. Harnisch
Associate Professor of
Educational Psychology

Laird W. Heal
Professor of Special
Education

L. Allen Phelps
Professor of Vocational
Education

Adelle M. Renzaglia
Associate Professor of
Special Education

Frank R. Rusch
Professor of Special
Education

Richard P. Schutz
Assistant Professor of
Special Education

Robert E. Stake
Professor of Educational
Psychology

Institute Advisory Committee

Secondary Transition Intervention Effectiveness Institute
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Dianne E. Berkell, Ph.D.
Department of Special Education
Long Island University
C. W. Post Center

Donn Brolin, Ph.D.
Department of Educational
and Counseling Psychology
University of Missouri-Columbia

R. Brian Cobb, Ph.D.
Department of Special Education
University of Vermont

Marge Goldberg
Pacer Center
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Dean Inman, Ph.D.
Center on Human Development
University of Oregon

Gary Lambour, Ph.D.
Special Education Consultant
Connecticut State Department
of Education

Robert L. Linn
Department of Educational
Psychology
University of Colorado-Boulder

Jeri Nowakowski, Ph.D.
Office of Educational Evaluation
and Policy Study
Northern Illinois University

Nick L. Smith, Ph.D.
School of Education
Syracuse University

Craig Thornton, Ph.D.
Mathematica Policy Research
Princeton, New Jersey

Susan S. Suter
Department of
Rehabilitation Services
Springfield, Illinois

Paul Wehman, Ph.D.
Rehabilitation Research and
Training Center
Virginia Commonwealth University

Claude Whitehead
Consultant
Washington, DC